



TOWN OF NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING MINUTES May 4, 2010

PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

Peter Stanley, Zoning Administrator
Norm Bernaiche, Chief Assessor
Noel Weinstein, New London resident
Larry Ballin, New London resident
Jim Wheeler, New London resident
Leigh Bosse, the *Messenger*
Pat Trader, *Intertown Record*

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

Building Permit Fees: Chair Helm recognized Peter Stanley, Zoning Administrator, who referred to a summary he prepared of building permit fees in neighboring towns and other towns across the state. Jessie Levine said that this was done in response to the concerns raised about New London's current building permit fees. Ms. Levine said that by way of background, the agenda packet contained the public notices from the last few public hearings to adopt new fees, and the minutes from those public hearings. Mr. Stanley said that when he started working for the Town in 2001, the Town was getting \$50 per building permit, which did not begin to cover the Town's costs for administering the permits. He said that some of the smaller towns still charge at that level, but the smaller towns that have nowhere near the commercial activity and level of regulations involved.

Mr. Stanley explained that an e-mail was sent out to the town manager list serve asking for building permit fee data, and the bulk of that information was compiled on the spreadsheet that the Selectmen had before them. Mr. Stanley said that for comparison purposes, he used a new house of 2500 SF or a value of \$350,000, since some towns' fees are based on the building value. He said that in some towns the fees accumulate, and some permit fees include inspections. He noted that the Town of Merrimack fees are actually higher than reflected on this chart because their \$300 "foundation fee" was not on their fee schedule.

Mr. Stanley said that there is not a huge amount of disparity in this area, but there is more in the southern towns, such as in Bow and Exeter, where there are impact fees. The towns around us are comparable; Newbury and Sunapee are quite similar and Hanover is higher. Mr. Stanley said that he thinks New London is about where we need to be for a town our size, and he sees no reason to raise or lower the fees at this time.

Peter Bianchi said he is the one who initiated the discussion on building permit fees. He asked if the fee schedule in the agenda packet and on-line is the same list, and Mr. Stanley confirmed that it is. Mr. Bianchi said that when the fees were changed in 2008, it had not been updated since 2003, and the 2008 minutes noted that the fees would probably have to be reviewed again. Mr. Bianchi noted that the sewer connection fees were not on the previous list. Ms. Levine said that the sewer connection fee has not changed but it was added to the list of town fees in 2009, when they tried to make the list of fees as comprehensive as possible. Ms. Levine said the connection fee was set by the Sewer Commissioners before the Board of Selectmen took over management. The process of sewer connections goes through the Department of Public Works, but it made sense to include the fees on this schedule. Mr. Bianchi said that he thinks the sewer connection fee is high and does not reflect the additional cost of hiring a contractor to connect to the sewer system. Ms. Levine said that there are other sewer connection fee approaches that can be reviewed if the Selectmen desire. Mr. Stanley said that some of the other towns have rationales for connection fees that might be more explanatory than our \$1 per SF fee.

Mr. Bianchi said that from 2003 to 2009, there was a substantial increase in the cost of building permits, from 10 cents to 30 cents per square foot. Mr. Bianchi said that \$1600 per house seems like a lot of money for a building permit for a house, and if someone is spending \$200,000 to build a new house, that does not seem like justification to charge more. Mr. Bianchi noted that we have increased the after-the-fact fees, such as for a sign permit. He asked about the after-the-fact building permit for residential homes, where the fee set in 2008 was \$200 plus \$.25 per SF, with no change from 2008 to 2009. Mr. Stanley agreed that the underlying square foot charge should have been changed in 2009 to \$0.30 per SF to match the regular building permit fee.

Mr. Bianchi said that he agrees with the idea of building permits and thinks the houses should be inspected. Mr. Stanley said that the closer a home is to a setback, the more attention has to be paid. He explained that subsequent inspections involve making sure that erosion control is in place, especially for waterfront property, and that nothing else gets added to the project that was not approved. Mr. Bianchi said that extra work is because we have to enforce the State's Shoreland Protection Act, which has added work for the town. He asked why a 3000 SF two-story building takes any more time than a 3000 SF building with a different footprint. Mr. Stanley said that the size of the house generally reflects that there is more involved, so we tried to follow a commonly-used principle to set fees, as opposed to using building value. Mr. Stanley said that the smaller projects, such as a shed with no foundation, take less time and less concern, but if an 8000 SF building is going to be built within six inches of a property boundary, a surveyor should mark the bound and a lot more attention has to be paid during the permit preparation. Mr. Stanley said this fee schedule is not a panacea – there are some properties that are easier and some that take longer, such as those on the lake. He gave the example of the Gorgi property on Route 103A, where he has probably spent two full days on the site on erosion control issues and working out issues with the builder. Mr. Bianchi said we are not trying to make money, and Mr. Stanley replied that the goal is a balance between revenue and expense, and it does not always even out but that is the hope.

Mr. Bianchi said that he does not see some of the fees on the schedule, such as the building permit to upgrade his kitchen floor. While he agrees that \$25 is not a lot of money, he does not see it on the list. He said that the website says permits are not needed for the replacement of windows, and he doesn't see that covered here either. He questioned the need for a building permit to change a toilet. Mr. Stanley said that the Zoning Ordinance definition of "alter" covers any improvement to a kitchen or bathroom, and that is because the assessor wants to capture the increased value associated with remodeling those rooms.

Mr. Bianchi said that from a common sense point of view, for something like his property on Pleasant Lake where the house is a tear down, it is the land that's worth a lot of money. His assessment is \$800,000, so the fact that he goes to Home Depot for a toilet should not increase the value. Ms. Levine

said that this sounds like a conversation that should include the assessors, since we are talking about building value and not building permit fees.

Mr. Kaplan said that it seems rational to include that because if a toilet does not work and is fixed, that changes the value of a home. Mr. Kaplan asked Mr. Bianchi why he wants to review all of this history and revisit this decision. Mr. Bianchi said that this seems to be simply a way to make money, and is a waste of money to send the assessor and town staff to inspect a project. Mr. Bianchi read from the website, which says a permit is not needed to replace-in-kind, and Mr. Stanley explained that in-kind means replacing a single-glaze window with a single-glaze window, but an upgrade should be reflected in the values of a property. Mr. Stanley said this idea did not originate with him, but he understands the need to pick up the value of properties as they are improved, for the sake of fairness.

Mr. Bianchi said that he is not one to add fees upon fees upon fees, and he does not want to nickel and dime people. He asked how to justify sending the assessor out to inspect a toilet replacement. He agreed that there are some fine lines involved, but asked where that line should be drawn – for just a toilet, he assumes the assessor would not go out, but what if a sink is added, or a shower, or lighting or flooring. Mr. Stanley said that upgrading is one story, and replacing in kind is another. Mr. Bianchi said that he would think those things would be caught during reinspection over the course of five years.

Larry Ballin reminded the board that this was all on the table less than a year ago, with a public hearing, and the fees were approved in the public domain, so he does not understand why it is being reviewed after-the-fact. Mr. Ballin said that the zoning ordinance keeps the property values in town strong, and anything that can be done to enhance property values, especially in these economic times, is a good thing. Mr. Ballin said this keeps the playing field level for the property owners.

Chair Helm asked Mr. Bianchi if, when townspeople come to him with questions, they could be directed to town employees such as Peter Stanley, Norm Bernaiche, or Jessie Levine. She said that it is not the Selectmen's role to respond to these questions and they should be directed to the people who are more knowledgeable. Mr. Bianchi disagreed and said that it is the Selectmen's role to justify the town's overall position when asked why something is as it is.

Abatement Recommendations: Chair Helm welcomed Chief Assessor Norm Bernaiche to discuss the abatement recommendations that were attached to the agenda packet. Mr. Bernaiche said that in this economy, the fact that there were only 12 applications is a good thing. He noted that the abatement application for Carr Land Holdings has been withdrawn because the property owners filed for current use.

Mr. Kaplan applauded Mr. Bernaiche for the abatement analysis; his memo shows that each individual application has been thought out and matched up with what is versus what might be, and he thinks Mr. Bernaiche did a "heck of a job." Mr. Bernaiche thanked Mr. Kaplan and said this abatement process raised a number of issues that should be addressed during the statistical update.

Mr. Bianchi asked about the first abatement application, which had only a \$3000 drop even though the home went from 5 to 2-bedrooms. Mr. Bernaiche explained that most condominium assessments are based on square footage and number of bathrooms. The total square footage of this condo was 900 SF, so the change from 5 to 2 bedrooms did not affect value much (they would have had to be five very small bedrooms).

Regarding the Edith Menkart application, Mr. Bianchi noted that Mr. Bernaiche recommended denying the abatement application. Mr. Bianchi said that the selling price was 8% less than the assessed value, not the 4% reflected in the median ratio. He noted that Mr. Bernaiche said the assessment was within

“acceptable limits,” and asked what that meant. Mr. Bernaiche said that the median ratio is an average, and there will be some data points higher and some lower to come up with that average. If he appraised the property for its sales price, he explained, he would be “sales chasing,” which assessors are not supposed to do. There may be a property that sells for \$187,000 that is assessed for \$169,000, and we would not adjust that property either. He said that in the Menkart’s case, the developer wanted to sell the lot and sold it for a good price, and there are other sales that support maintaining the value on this property.

Mr. Bianchi asked again what “acceptable limits” meant, and Mr. Bernaiche said that it is generally being within 10% of sale price. He reiterated that to make a change due to a sale would be sales chasing, and he would probably have to make something up to affect the value of the property that much. In this case, he said, it is a view lot with good topography, and there is nothing wrong with it that would cause him to reduce the value based on the sale.

Mr. Bianchi referred to the Armstrong abatement, which went up and then down again. Mr. Bernaiche said that getting into the home helped refine the value of that property, and when one cannot get into a home, it has to be looked at in the best light. A lot of information came to them after the fact that clarified matters for the abatement.

Mr. Bianchi asked for the total impact of the abatements in value, and Mr. Kaplan said it’s a downward adjustment of \$333,950, which, based on a \$15 tax rate, is about \$5,000. Ms. Levine said that this is far lower than the \$53,000 of overlay set aside when they set the 2009 tax rate. Mr. Bernaiche said that the building permit pickups to date have amounted to about \$6 million in new value.

Mr. Bianchi noted that there are still outstanding legal appeals, such as Cantor and Broom. Chair Helm asked if Mr. Bernaiche anticipates any appeals with any of the abatements reviewed today. Mr. Bernaiche said that could happen but the dollar amounts are not significant.

Chair Helm echoed what Mr. Kaplan said about the work Mr. Bernaiche has done.

Mr. Kaplan moved to approve all of the abatements as recommended by Mr. Bernaiche. Mr. Bianchi seconded the motion for discussion. There was no discussion and the motion was approved 3-0.

Property Tax Warrant: Ms. Levine said that the property tax warrant is ready pending the Selectmen’s decision on the abatements, so those changes have to be made. She asked the Selectmen to authorize preparation of the warrant between meetings so that the bills could be sent out before the next Selectmen’s meeting on May 17. Mr. Kaplan moved to approve the warrant, seconded by Mr. Bianchi. No discussion and authorized 3-0. *N.B. The warrant was completed before the end of the meeting, so the Board of Selectmen signed the property tax warrant when it was presented.*

Meeting Minutes: Mr. Kaplan moved to approve the minutes of April 19, 2010. Mr. Bianchi seconded the motion. The following corrections were made:

- Page 13: Chair Helm inserted a missing word
- Page 5: Mr. Bianchi change “Community” Advisory Committee to “Citizens” Advisory Committee
- Page 11: Mr. Bianchi asked to record who voted which way in the motion and said he would like to have that done from now on. Also on page 11, Mr. Bianchi noted that he did not agree with the recommendation to have Ms. Levine issue the permit, as he did not agree with the underlying motion. He thought that should be clarified.

Mr. Bianchi moved to accept the minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Kaplan and approved 3-0.

Chair Helm asked for a motion on whether split votes should be reflected by name in the minutes. Mr. Bianchi moved to have the minutes reflect who voted for or against a motion. Mr. Kaplan seconded the motion for discussion. Motion passed 2 (Bianchi, Helm) to 1 (Kaplan).

Sewer Rates: Ms. Levine distributed a spreadsheet showing the sewer budget and revenues to-date, and recommended keeping the rates the same at \$12.50 per 1000 gallons for operating expenses and debt, plus 50 cents per 1000 for capital reserves. She reviewed the agenda attachments, which included similar spreadsheets for previous rate-setting periods. She said that although they would be collecting less than half of the budget with the first billing, there should be offsetting revenue before the second billing that would balance out collections. Mr. Kaplan moved to approve the sewer rate at \$13 per 1000 gallons, seconded by Mr. Bianchi and approved 3-0.

Parking Request: Chair Helm referred to an e-mail received from Karen Slogic of Shaker Street regarding the parking on Main Street. The e-mail suggested that due to the narrowness of Main Street, parking should be permanently banned on one side of the street. Mr. Kaplan said that the Selectmen have always followed the recommendation of the Police Department. Ms. Levine said that she has spoken to the Police Chief, and he does not think this change is necessary. She added that she thinks businesses would object to a reduction of parking on Main Street. Mr. Bianchi said he understands Ms. Slogic's point, but Main Street is just narrow. Chair Helm said she understands what Ms. Slogic is saying but she does not see it as a major issue and recommends that people drive more slowly. Mr. Bianchi said that this issue was made worse under his previous reign years ago, when it was pushed by the Town Administrator to put the telephone poles inside the curbs, and therefore the curbs had to be moved out. That made Main Street even more narrow, and he was the sole vote against the decision at the time.

Chair Helm said that Ms. Slogic makes a reasonable point, but asked Ms. Levine to let her know that the Selectmen are not going to take action on this at this time.

Wastewater Project Funding: Chair Helm recognized Noel Weinstein, who said that his concern is that the Town be the most straight-forward as possible in applying for grants, and that it sounded "devious" to apply for funds when we were the major grantee in the name of a town that might get a more favorable result, in this grant or any grant. Chair Helm asked Mr. Weinstein if he felt that Ms. Levine's response to his e-mail was valid, and Mr. Weinstein said that he thinks it was a reasonable response.

Mr. Kaplan explained that there had been a sewer meeting with the Sunapee Sewer Commission last Thursday, and at that time it came out that Sunapee owns that wastewater treatment plant, and we are considered a user, but not an owner. Mr. Kaplan said that it was the people from the USDA who explained that the application should be done a certain way, and we provided the information requested, and the supervisor in Vermont sent the application back. Mr. Kaplan said the fact comes down to Sunapee owning the equipment, and they should apply for the grant.

Mr. Bianchi said that he had read Mr. Weinstein's e-mail and agreed with what he was saying, and due to his own negligence when sitting on the Citizen's Advisory Committee, it was not clear to him that we did not qualify from square one. In doing research, he found that the Sewer Commission knew all along that we did not qualify for grants that depended on median income. He said we were being up front in that we did not qualify from square one, and though he is uncomfortable with the way Sunapee and the engineer are doing it, it is the way it is recommended being done. He said there was talk about New London being considered a "bulk user," and that remains to be seen. He thinks it should have been made more clear at

Town Meeting that New London did not qualify and that this was the way we were told to do it. Mr. Bianchi said that he was not aware at the time and he has talked to others who were not aware.

Mr. Kaplan said that he agrees with Mr. Weinstein and does not want to fool the federal government, but if Sunapee owns it and Sunapee says it's going to cost \$8 million to fix it, they are asking for a grant in order to help them do their project, so they have every right to apply for it. If it is agreed that they get the grant and have a huge amount of money that needs to be borrowed, it's up to the Town of Sunapee to decide how to do that.

Mr. Ballin reminded the Selectmen that it is not the Town of New London that is accepting the grant, it is the whole project. The USDA recommended applying in this manner -- and he recollects it clearly from the meetings that were held -- and the RDA said that the application was done incorrectly. He thinks it's bureaucratic wrangling. The Town of New London did not apply for the grant, and there was nothing devious or misleading about the way the Selectmen went about the process.

Mr. Weinstein said that what he heard at the CAC meeting was "we're getting away with something" because Sunapee gets a better rating, and he did not think that was right. Mr. Bianchi said that he has had other people talk to him about it, and said Mr. Weinstein is not unique in his understanding.

Ms. Levine said she resents the assertion that there was any intention to keep this secret -- it was discussed at every public meeting between the Selectmen and the Sunapee Sewer Commission, and if it was not said in Selectmen's meetings following that, it is because it was understood by all involved. Chair Helm added that we were relying on the advice of people we were working with, and we received erroneous information. Chair Helm said that either the project will get the money or it won't, and if it does not, then we will still be faced with needing to repair the sewer system with no grant funding.

Mr. Bianchi said he understood from the meeting last Thursday that we should hear on the revised grant within a matter of weeks. Mr. Kaplan said that the effect of this refurbishment of the equipment is to improve the water quality that is returned to the Sugar River and downstream, benefitting the people in Newport and Claremont who do not contribute to the plant.

Chair Helm thanked Mr. Weinstein for bringing this issue to the forefront, and hopes that those who had concerns about this now understand a little better about what went on and what is going on and that we can move forward.

Pleasant Street Sidewalk: Ms. Levine said that she and Richard Lee had attended meetings in Concord and the project had received approval from the Natural Resources Board and the Historic Resources Board. They are in the process of meeting with property owners along the sidewalk, and have to apply to the federal government for approval to do the construction in-house.

Pleasant Lake & Mill Pond Dams: Ms. Levine said that Clough, Harbour and Associates would like to expand its dam engineering office in New Hampshire and is willing to provide free preliminary engineering advice on both the Pleasant Lake and the Mill Pond (Mesa) Dam. There will be a meeting with the NH Dam Bureau inspector on May 18. Mr. Bianchi asked about New London resident Jud Dohaghy's involvement, as he is a dam engineer. Ms. Levine said that he had initially offered to help and she gave him a large volume of information, but she believes that his schedule is full.

Main Street Paving: Ms. Levine said the Main Street paving project has been extended to Spring Ledge Farm, and the NH Department of Transportation is fixing more drainage than originally planned, which is a good thing but has delayed the project somewhat. She said the New London Department of Public

Works is raising the sewer manholes now so that they will be ready for the final coat of pavement in mid-May.

Ms. Levine said that there will be 150 lilacs planted at Crockett's Corner, which will be very nice. Mr. Kaplan asked about the islands, and Ms. Levine said there will be crabapple trees planted but nothing else because it would be difficult to maintain in the islands.

Elkins Grant: Ms. Levine shared the grant approval list with the Board of Selectmen and noted that a number of lower ranked projects were funded. She said that the top project from each of the nine regional planning commissions was supposed to receive funding, but it appeared that only six had, and that lower ranked projects were moved up. She said that she was glad that she did not know that there was the possibility that the grant would not be funded, as she would have been more worried about the ultimate decision.

Legislative activity: Ms. Levine handed out a spreadsheet showing the impact of the Governor's budget proposal, which impacts New London at about \$30,000 between the 10% reduction of Meals & Rooms Tax and the decrease in state match for the police & fire retirement contributions. Ms. Levine said that figure does not include the match for teacher retirement. Mr. Kaplan said that starting in 2011, New London will also be on the hook for \$1,014,000 in the Statewide Property Tax, which will be about \$1 per thousand on the tax rate. Mr. Kaplan said that he spoke to Senator Bob Odell and Representative Randy Foose regarding SB 465, which included the proposal to form a study group. Mr. Kaplan is hopeful that will take place, even though it looks like the extension of the collar will not take place. He hopes the study group will consider a change in the formula for how the money is collected and distributed. Mr. Kaplan said Senator Odell felt that even if the group is not formed by legislative action, the Governor would form a commission to do the same work.

Mr. Ballin said that he has heard that the intent is that nothing will get done until after the election, when there is the "promise" from the Governor that the commission will be a priority agenda item and will move forward immediately.

Mr. Bianchi said that it is amazing that we have 1/10th of the grand list of Manchester, and that is killing us. Chair Helm encouraged people to participate at the state level and to go to Concord and make their case.

Ms. Levine reported that the broadband bonding bill was being worked on today by a subcommittee and would be voted on this afternoon. She would not be able to attend, but Hanover Town Manager Julia Griffin and Sunapee Town Manager Donna Nashawaty would attend.

Committee Meeting and Reports:

Lake Sunapee Watershed Task Force, April 21: Ms. Levine attended the April 21 meeting and reported that Richard Lee had attended, as well as the road agents from Sunapee and Newbury. She said that there is a summary forum being held on May 12, and the LSPA would like elected officials from the three communities to attend.

Planning Board, April 27: Mr. Bianchi said the Planning Board meeting was a quick meeting with two minor applications: one from Annie Ballin regarding New London Area Center for the Arts, which was approved without the need for a site plan, and one from Peter Messer requesting a waiver to have his whole property surveyed for a minor subdivision for his daughter. The meeting was over by 8:30 PM. Chairman will be Tom Cottrill, Jeff Hollinger will be vice chair, and Mike Doheny will be secretary.

KRSD Facilities Committee, April 27: Tina Helm, Jim Wheeler and Chad Denning attended the KRSD Facilities Committee meeting on April 27 to talk about putting the skateboard park on school property in New London. The Facilities Committee was extremely supportive of the project and supported looking into the land behind Country Press on Cougar Court. The School Board is being asked to allow the park to be built there; the Board did not approve it yet because they wanted more information about how the space would be used, but the general feeling is that it's a good place for the skateboard park. Chair Helm said that she and Ms. Levine attended the Skatepark Committee meeting last night to discuss the presentation and design that will be brought to the School Board on May 27.

Ms. Levine said that at last night's meeting, there was a suggestion that Town receive the school property, which could be done by special town meeting or wait until town meeting in March. Ms. Levine said that both the voters of the District and the Town would have to approve the exchange of land. Mr. Kaplan asked who would operate the skatepark, and Chair Helm explained that the town would own the land and operate the skate park but there would be private fundraising so that the construction and maintenance of the park would be covered by private funds.

Mr. Bianchi said that he does not think the other towns would approve giving the land to the town of New London. Ms. Levine said that the intention is for the park to be a regional facility, and she hopes that would persuade the other towns to go along with the idea.

Mr. Weinstein asked about the proximity of the skatepark to the elementary school and whether the mix of ages would be detrimental. Chair Helm said that is still being discussed and there are concerns about security issues from the school's standpoint.

Upcoming Meetings:

Joint Boards of Selectmen: May 6 in Bradford. Mr. Bianchi will represent the Selectmen.

Lake Sunapee Watershed Task Force: May 12 in Sunapee

Budget Committee: Ms. Levine presented a proposed schedule to the Board of Selectmen that suggested that the budget would go from the Department Heads to the Selectmen and then to the Budget Committee. Chair Helm said that this process would allow the Selectmen to define budget priorities earlier, and then present a more comprehensive picture to the Budget Committee. Ms. Levine said that the Selectmen set the big picture priorities in March, and the budget process would allow the program level priorities to be discussed. Chair Helm said that she hopes the Selectmen can be more articulate to the Budget Committee this year in terms of where the Selectmen are coming from. Ms. Levine said the statutes suggest that it is the Selectmen's budget that is presented to the Budget Committee, and this proposed schedule is a deviation from what's happened in the past.

Chair Helm asked Ms. Levine to remind the Selectmen of their role vs. the Budget Committee's role in the budget process. Ms. Levine said that she will prepare a memo for the Selectmen.

Mr. Kaplan said that by having budget meetings early on, people thought they would be able to make good decisions and it would be easier than waiting towards the end of the process. What happened was decisions were made in September that were then modified or changed later in the process, and that led to a great deal of frustration. This proposed schedule recognizes that and says that the legwork will be done up front and will be brought to the Budget Committee to be picked apart and finalized.

With respect to the change in fiscal year, Mr. Kaplan asked what 18-month period will be considered, and Ms. Levine said that it will run from January 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012. Mr. Weinstein asked how a change in fiscal year would impact the tax rate. Ms. Levine said that it will help to hold over some surplus to use to offset the 18-month budget, and that quarterly billing would also keep the impact down because the expense would be spread across six bills rather than three.

Chair Helm asked if the first May town Meeting would be in 2012, and Ms. Levine confirmed that it would, assuming Town Meeting approves the change.

Mr. Bianchi said he does not care when the Budget Committee meets and he does not think the Selectmen should tell them when to meet. Ms. Levine said that she was asked to do a proposed schedule, and this is what she has prepared. Chair Helm noted that the schedule is proposed and that the Budget Committee may reject it. Mr. Bianchi said that ultimately the decision is theirs and they are not under the Selectmen's jurisdiction. Mr. Kaplan said they are part of the town and still have to work with the Selectmen, and their decisions affect everybody in New London, so he hopes they can work together.

Chair Helm and Mr. Kaplan both said that they are okay with bringing the proposed schedule forward to the Budget Committee.

Other Business

Fuel Bids: Ms. Levine said that Finance Officer Carol Fraley has sought fuel bids from area vendors, and referred to a spreadsheet with Ms. Fraley's recommendations. Irving's bid on propane was \$1.669 compared to Dead River at \$1.7958. Fred Fuller's oil bid was \$2.625 compared to Dead River at \$2.9534 and Irving at \$2.895.

Mr. Bianchi moved to approve purchasing propane from Irving at \$1.669 per gallon and oil from Fred Fuller at \$2.625 per gallon for the 2010-2011 heating year. Mr. Kaplan seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0.

Signatures

Application for Building Permits:

- Judy Morrissey, 145 Tracy Road (Map & Lot 117-011-000) garden shed – Permit #10-035 – Approved.
- Ronni C. Brenner Trust, 184 Turkey Hill (Map & Lot 051-019-000) two story addition to existing residence – Permit #10-036 – Approved.
- John Stewart, 46 Wilmot Center Road (Map & Lot 077-020-000) interior renovations – Permit #10-037 – Approved.
- Elizabeth Meller, 142 Job Seamans Acres (Map & Lot 060-017-000) interior renovations – Permit #10-038 – Approved.

Application for temporary sign permit:

- The Fells Corporation, Newbury – putting sign at Information booth for annual plant sale June 19, 2010 – Approved.

Application for use of Sydney Crook Conference room:

- Adventures in learning – 9/21-10/12 Tuesdays 8:45-11:45 – Approved.

Tax Abatements:

- Timothy Wick, 20 Hilltop Place, (Map & Lot 144-001-020) reduce assessment in the amount of \$720.37 – Approved
- Albert X. Widmer, 482 Lakeshore Drive (Map & Lot 037-013-000) reduce assessment in the amount of \$2194.19 – Approved
- Lawrence & Jane Armstrong, 166 Old Main St. (Map & Lot 107-016-000) reduce assessment in the amount of \$59,100.00 – Approved
- Anthony R. Galluzzo, 443 Mountain Road (Map & Lot 101-001-000) reduce assessment in the amount of \$209.47 – Approved
- Joan F. Pankhurst, 7 Lyon Brook (Map & Lot 072-020-007) reduce assessment in the amount of \$48.51 – Approved
- Stuart & Victoria Gulker, 606 Wilmot Center Road (Map & Lot 053-004-000) reduce assessment in the amount of \$375.24 – Approved
- Wendy Collins, 122 Hilltop Place (Map & Lot 144-001-122) reduce assessment in the amount of \$693.69 – Approved
- Joan Broom, 168 Hastings Landing Road (Map & Lot 116-004-00) abatement request - Denied.
- Rae Ann Gremel Revocable Trust, 1539 Little Sunapee Road (Map & Lot 030-006-000) abatement request – Denied
- Edith Menkart, Surrey Lane (Map & Lot 094-004-012) abatement request – Denied

Other:

- Disbursement voucher week of April 25, & May 3, 2010 - Approved.
- Property Tax Warrant for 1st half billing -- Approved
- Sewer Betterment, Edmunds Road Property Tax 1st Levy – (\$6200.00) – Approved.
- PSNH pole replacement & pole licenses – Approved.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:40 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessie Levine
Town Administrator