

**MINUTES OF MEETING
MUNICIPAL BUDGET COMMITTEE
June 29, 2010**

A meeting of the Municipal Budget Committee was called to order at 7:00 PM in the Meeting Room at the Conway Town Hall with the following members present: Chairman Jim LeFebvre, Bob Drinkhall, Doug Swett, Bill Masters, Bill Aughton, Raymond Shakir, Joe Mosca, Linda Teagan and John Edgerton. Members excused from meeting: Karen Umberger. Members absent from meeting: David Sordi and Janine McLauchlan.

Chairman LeFebvre asked John Edgerton to lead the members in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Bob Drinkhall moved, seconded by Bill Masters, to consider and accept the Minutes of May 3, 2010, as amended. In favor: 9; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 0.

Bob Drinkhall stated on page 14, second paragraph, fourth line, change "by" to "to" so that the sentence will read "... there was an increase in what it cost to \$17,316.00 ...". Bob further stated on page 16, first paragraph, twelfth line, add "less" after \$200,000.00.

NEW BUSINESS

John Edgerton moved, seconded by Jim LeFebvre, to accept the letter. In favor: 8; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 1 - Bob Drinkhall.

Chairman LeFebvre stated the second item on the Agenda is the letter handed out dated 30 June 2010 and the subject of the letter is the Public Works Service Garage and it's to the Conway Selectmen. Some background: based on recommendations and suggestions from several members of the Committee that they wanted to approach this yet again with the Town, three members put together draft letters and the third draft is a combination of that work done by the Chairman, Mr. Masters and Ms. Umberger. Chairman further stated that he would like to walk the members through the letter so that the members could see what they are talking about and why they did it the way they did it. At the end, Chairman will be asking for a yes or no vote to give it, send it or transmit it to the Selectmen.

Chairman LeFebvre proceeded with reviewing the letter. The first paragraph states that the Budget Committee met on the 29th and approved it; that's assuming of course that the Committee does and if not, this becomes moot. The second paragraph is basically a history, it talks about the fact that we recognize the need for a new garage and we supported the Warrant Article 8 to 2 and why there were some negative votes. We also supported 8 to 3 the Capital Reserve Warrant Article. Then it states our understanding that the Selectmen have determined on a vote of 3 to 2 to proceed with the refurbishment of the current Public Works garage and that the first phase of this refurbishment is estimated to cost approximately \$225,000.00. Chairman asked Bob Drinkhall, the Select Board

representative, if that number appears to be correct to his recollection. Bob stated he believed it to be \$228,000.00 and read the following from the Minutes of the Select Board: Mr. Weathers moved, seconded by Mr. DeGregorio, for the \$41,000.00 boiler option using the heated units from the School. There was a discussion of the condition and with this recommendation the total cost for repairs will be \$228,000.00. Chairman stated he would make the change on the one, if approved, that goes to the Selectmen.

Chairman proceeded with the letter by stating that it is recognized that Selectmen have the authority to expend this money in any way they deem appropriate based on the fact that the money has already been placed in the fund or has been approved by the Warrant Article for 2010 for an additional \$75,000.00 in the Capital Reserve Fund. The third paragraph continues with suggestions. For the purposes of discussion, it is suggested that they consider upgrading one bay of the current Public Works Storage garage to serve as a temporary maintenance facility; further request that \$100,000.00 be placed in the Maintenance of Town Buildings and Facilities Capital Reserve Account for the 2011 Warrant and that the remaining costs for a new building also be placed on the 2011 Warrant. Chairman further stated, based on a conversation he had yesterday with Lucy (Philbrick), there is currently \$214,000.00 in the Capital Reserve Fund and not yet placed is the \$75,000.00 that was put on the Warrant for 2010. Therefore, once that money is placed into that account it brings it up to \$289,000.00. If they do what we just recommended and place another \$100,000.00 on the Warrant for the Capital Reserve Fund, that will bring it up to \$389,000.00; subtract \$39,000.00 from that total for an emergency boiler, destruction of a tank like the Conway Elementary School had and that sort of thing, it brings it down to \$350,000.00. That means that the Warrant Article for the additional money to finish the garage, presuming they don't use any of the monies elsewhere other than the \$39,000.00 just talked about, would cost approximately \$250,000.00. So, for \$350,000.00 plus using what's in the Reserve Account currently, you have the money necessary to build a new garage, a completely new garage as opposed to refurbishing the 60+ year old building and that is only Phase I of the repair work as he understands it. Bob Drinkhall stated that the Chairman was correct. Chairman further stated that is the synopsis or the mathematics to do the work.

Bob Drinkhall stated between this and what has been talked about for next year, we're talking about \$400,000.00 in the old garage. Chairman LeFebvre stated there is a Phase II under consideration by the Select Board for which they have no funding. John Edgerton asked if a garage could be built for \$400,000.00 and Bob Drinkhall stated other people did it.

Chairman LeFebvre stated his question is: If we are looking at refurbishing the old garage for \$400,000.00, why don't we go to \$600,000.00 total, some of which is already funded and build a brand new one which will last a lot longer than the current facility even under repair. Bob Drinkhall stated on a new garage, we're talking 50 to 60 years, and even if they go the full route with the old garage we're only talking 20 years. Chairman further stated to the members, you can see the

situation we are facing and the reason why some of us decided to put this letter together for the consideration of the Select Board.

Doug Swett asked if anything had been discussed about the roof that needs to be replaced on the building being used temporarily. Bob Drinkhall stated that's on hold temporarily; it's not going to be done this year. Doug stated you are going in there to use it for a garage. Bob stated we are not going in there, we are in there. Doug asked if the roof leaks and Bob stated he was not sure, he knows the condition of the roof but he was not sure of the severity of any leaks at this point in time.

Chairman LeFebvre stated he wanted to finish going through the letter before opening the meeting to questions. Bob Drinkhall asked the Chairman to go over the funding again. Chairman stated in the current Capital Reserve Fund there's \$214,000.00 plus \$75,000.00 bringing it to \$289,000.00. If you do \$100,000.00 into the Capital Reserve Fund, in other words you're putting money back into the Capital Reserve Fund like you've been doing all along, for 2011; then you subtract \$39,000.00 for a real, true emergency like the destruction of a boiler tank, brings you down to \$350,000.00. Then you go in for a Warrant Article for the new garage note-wise as opposed to a bond issue; \$350,000.00 and \$250,000.00 brings you up to \$600,000.00. The monies that you don't need to spend on the new garage, if there are any, stay in the Capital Reserve Fund. If the new Garage comes in at \$550,000.00, you'll still have \$50,000.00 in the Capital Reserve Fund.

Chairman LeFebvre proceeded with paragraph 4 of the letter by stating we believe if approached properly and we do a better job of selling it to the voters, the strategy outlined above will eliminate the need to put a bond on the Warrant. You'll have a Note which does not have the bond 60% requirement and with 50% plus 1 you win. That's something we didn't do last year, it was a mistake, an administrative mistake and we can go back in and fix that this year. The fifth paragraph of page 1 talks about the fact that if we are correct in our assessment, the end result will be a state of the art facility that will serve the Town of Conway for many years to come. Chairman was not going to say 50 or 60, but he was sure it was more than 20. The current plan to refurbish the garage will only result in taxpayers being faced with a requirement for a new maintenance facility in the relatively near future. The last paragraph on page two is the request for the Select Board to reconsider their current course of action and the statement that the Budget Committee stands ready to discuss this issue with them at their convenience because they are the governing body that will direct where the money in the Capital Reserve Fund is going to be spent.

John Edgerton stated he had two comments about the past and the past is behind us, but asking for "fed funds" was a big mistake and the quibbling that went on between the Budget Committee members, the Select members and between the Selectmen and the Budget Committee really defeated the entire garage; that is what people didn't like. Chairman LeFebvre stated he agreed with John's assessment. John further stated if we can't agree and there was a consensus among the Selectmen and the Budget Committee that we needed the garage but the quibbling went on, screwed it up so nobody would vote for it.

Raymond Shakir stated he had several comments. First of all, he didn't believe that it had been emphasized enough in the letter that the total cost for renovation will exceed \$400,000.00 and he didn't think it was brought out enough at all, for example that the \$400,000.00 is basically monopoly money because you're throwing it away, you're still going to need a brand new garage. This is just a band aid approach and it doesn't suggest that at all. So, that's two points that he feels should be emphasized in the note and it should also be emphasized to the public, many of which would be under the impression that after you spend over \$400,000.00 to put into this whatever you want to call it out there, it's still a band aid approach and you're still going to need a new garage and he didn't think there's a lot of people that know that. The other thing is that he didn't think that we should play around with the Capital Reserve Fund with this money. The Capital Reserve Fund should be a completely separate item from this because the Capital Reserve Fund takes care of all Town emergency requirements and routine requirements and we should go for raw money on the garage construction. If we present it in a forthright simple common sense way, it will pass overwhelmingly without having to butter it up by using Capital Reserve money. In fact, he believes that if we ask for a reasonable amount of money for the garage, we are all going to be pleasantly surprised to find, if it's watched right and managed correctly, that we have money to put away in our pockets that we can divert over to the Capital Reserve Fund and increase that fund.

Bill Aughton stated if he heard Ray right we actually do have a figure of \$400,000.00 on the renovations. Chairman LeFebvre asked to interrupt for just a second and stated what we are discussing in the letter is Phase I cost of \$228,000.00 for 2010; that is money that is already in the Capital Reserve Fund. For educational purposes for the folks who are new to the Board specifically, money that is already in the Capital Reserve Fund falls under the governing body purview, they can do whatever they wish with it. Any money for Phase II or Phase III or Phase IV, if they elect to go that route, would have to be approved by the voters. Bob Drinkhall stated there would have to be an amount put in to that fund next year and would have to go to a vote. Chairman stated when he wrote the letter along with the other two members of the Committee the \$228,000.00, instead of the initial \$225,000.00, is already funds they have available for use. Anything for Phase II which exceeds the \$289,000.00 given earlier which is the \$214,000.00 plus the \$75,000.00 for this year that has not been put in the fund yet, would be subject to a vote of the Town. Therefore, it's not counted in the letter, we are only talking about the money they are already authorized to spend.

Bill Aughton stated he understood that, but it is difficult for him to say it's okay and when you don't know what the rest of it is. Chairman LeFebvre asked Bob Drinkhall if he had the estimated total cost for Phase II. Bob Drinkhall stated he did not and in fact he couldn't find it in the Minutes, he was holding up the Minutes for March because he wanted to have it in those Minutes and he was having that researched because he wants it to be a part of the public record. Chairman asked if the total is in excess of \$400,000.00 and Bob stated to the best of his recollection and belief it is; it was mentioned and we're talking about

with what's being done now, you still have a building that is not insulated, you have a building that the roof can not hold a normal snow load but that is cured by the fact that the heat melts the snow even in the year before last when we had about 133 inches of snow there was no problem because it all melted. In order to insulate the building, you're not only insulating the building, you have to rebuild the roof; you either have to put a pitch roof on or strengthen the existing roof.

Chairman LeFebvre stated the reason they did not address Phase II is because Phase II does not have funding of any sort at this time. Therefore, to keep the letter clean and simple, they only addressed the funds that are currently available to spend on the garage. He did not want to get into hypotheticals that they might spend another \$200,000.00 next year if they get the money.

Bill Aughton stated the second point he had is the cost; doesn't say what the cost of the modifications to the Storage Garage are. Chairman LeFebvre stated that needs to be determined, can't tell you that; they are already in the building and using that. Bob Drinkhall stated for the heavy equipment his understanding is they are in the building currently; they are not in the building for small vehicles, like the Police cruisers and such because that has a lift which is in the old garage in the Annex, so they are still utilizing that. Bill stated his point is there is an unknown cost here. Bob stated if you were able to do a major or a semi-major improvement in the now Storage Garage you would be correct. Bill stated the magnitude of it isn't his interest, his interest is what is it going to cost to do this temporarily; this is a missing figure for him. Bill proceeded with his third point: we talked about selling it to the voters and he was not sure that was the best phrase explaining exactly how and why we are going to do it. That has been a bee in his bonnet; who's going to do that. He has heard really good discussions around this table about what we need to tell the public but nobody ever did it for 2 years. Bob stated remember we were only 43 votes off from the 60%; if you reduce it down to 50%, we already technically if it remained the same, have the vote because we got 57.7%. There has to be a consensus; it wasn't even unanimous on the Board of Selectmen let alone between the Board of Selectmen and the Budget Committee. We do need that consensus and he believes that is what was missing the most. It has gone on and there has been so much discussion, the average person he was sure only follows a minimal amount of it and they're confused. Bob further stated it was beyond his comprehension why they would vote for a Bike Lane for \$308,000.00 but turn down a new garage which would maintain that Bike Lane if we were to get it. It just doesn't make sense and he didn't think it would be difficult to sell at this point in time.

Chairman LeFebvre stated we are really not huckstering, it is something that is necessary, something that the Board of Selectmen and he believed this Budget Committee both agree is necessary; the question is how do we do it in the most cost effective manner for the Town without wasting \$400,000.00 for a repair of a garage that at best will last 20 years. Bob Drinkhall stated to answer some of what Bill had brought up and others, tomorrow morning at 10:00 AM is the pre-bid meeting; they have already moved into the Storage Garage. The bids will be opened on July 13th at 1:00 PM for the renovations. In order to change anything that's going on

right now and he has to speak for the Board of Selectmen as a whole and not necessarily how he feels, 3 members are adamant about going forward with this and the only way it could be changed at this point in time is for one of those 3 members to open it up. It can't be done by someone who voted against it. Bill Aughton stated that was a very interesting comment to hear. Bob further stated that would have to be done almost immediately. Chairman stated he wanted to briefly interrupt Bob and stated to Bill that it is standard *Roberts Rules of Order* when a vote is taken and a reconsideration action is necessary, a member from the prevailing side must open it up for reconsideration. So it is one of the 3 members of the Board of Selectmen who voted for it would have to re-open it for reconsideration.

Bill Aughton stated the last question he had are the life expectancy dates; whoever does whatever work should be able to put an approximate time frame; is the renovation good for 20 years; is the new building good for 50; can we tell the voters things like that or are we just saying the new building is going to last longer than the renovations, we know it is but by how much. Chairman LeFebvre stated the concrete blocks that were tested at the cost of \$2,000.00, the estimate was that they were good for 20 years. Bob Drinkhall stated he didn't know the specific, couldn't recall if that was a specific amount but they are structurally sound as far as the blocks are concerned but they are not seismically sound. Chairman stated if we have an earthquake of biblical proportions, the building will tumble. Bob stated that with that type of wall in particular, there is a way to reinforce it, but that's another situation. Chairman stated the estimate that you heard from Bob of 50 years is based on the fact that the current garage is over 60 years old and even if that is wrong by 10 years, 40 years as opposed to 20 is clearly a savings to the Town of Conway.

Bill Masters stated it was his understanding in talking with the Town Engineer once they complete all of the renovations, the building will not be in compliance with Codes. That's where you are after you spend that amount of money, the building will not meet all of the Building Codes. John Edgerton asked how can we do that. Bill Masters stated the envelope for the new building if you construct a new building, the envelope meaning the whole structural frame, will not require any basic maintenance for 20 years. The existing membrane on the current garage roof membrane, because it is a built up roof and it has a flat membrane, will have to be replaced within 5 years. The current flat roof will not support snow loads period, so you are going to have to heat the building no matter what. The maintenance of that is going to be phenomenal in just trying to bring that old structure up to standards. He is 70 years old and has had 2 hips replaced; you're not going to get another 25 years out of him no matter what you do, no matter how much money you sink into him, the point you've got is you either want a new structure or you want to waste taxpayer money. Why piecemeal them to death? If this first section is just a package, the point of this letter is to get them to reconsider that option. What happens is you're going to get \$450,000.00 now; 5 years from now another \$200,000.00 and beyond that who knows what. If we have a seismic event and if they say it doesn't happen up here, ask the people in Toronto whether it happens. We happen to have a fault that goes through New Hampshire whether most people realize it or not. Now there is

a 20% chance of something happening here versus the West Coast, but still it makes absolutely no sense not to go forward and ask them to address that. As a citizen and not a member of the Budget Committee, he read the advertisement and with that had a lot of questions which he sent to Earl Sires last week addressing a good segment of the questions he had in determining the total cost of everything to bring that up to Code. Earl is on vacation. Bill shared that with Jim because he didn't want as a member of the Budget Committee for it to be a surprise. He would think we would want to know when you make decisions and he has some problems with the figures, he wants to know precisely what it is going to cost to bring that old building up to standards that will last the lifetime of the new building. If we don't know, how can we make a concerted decision.

Chairman LeFebvre stated the action in front of the Committee right now, and if he had to he would limit discussion, is either to approve this letter as written with minor modifications or to forget this letter. Bob Drinkhall stated he wanted to shoot out 5 things that will not be taken care of with what is going on right now. The roof has a short life span which was just mentioned; the walls and roof are not insulated which was just mentioned. What hasn't been mentioned is the doors are not tall enough for 2 vehicles which are currently being inspected outdoors which is not in compliance with what the State requires; the building is not to Seismic Code which has been discussed; and continued high heating costs which we are losing with the way the building is now is at least \$3,000.00 to \$5,000.00 a year in heating costs, wasted heating costs plus the waste oil. The waste oil could be shifted over to the other garage and used to heat that at a savings there.

Linda Teagan stated she had one question in reference to bringing the building up to Code. She understood that if you did substantial renovations on a building it had to be brought up to Code. Her question would be: if a private citizen applied for the renovations on this building and that amount of money was put into it, would they be allowed to put the renovations in and leave the building not up to Code. Bob Drinkhall stated government unfortunately doesn't have to do as it claims others must do. As a good example, Bob has been on the Planning Board for about 10 years and government entities do not have to follow any of the regulations whatsoever; they do have to come before the Planning Board at least 60 days before begin any project; however, the Planning Board can only make recommendations and they can say "no" to all of them. This is much the same. Linda stated that may be the case, but she doesn't have to support money by a government that exempts itself from the regulations that a private citizen would have to go through. That is just a slap in the face to everybody who has to go down to the Town and bring their permit application to change out a window. Linda further asked if the Selectmen were willing to accept that, that they are going to put these renovations in willy-nilly, helter skelter and get away with something that the average person can't get away with. She assumes the Code is for safety and there is some reason behind the Code which is not necessarily in evidence. She just can't see doing something like this. Bob stated one of his projects that he volunteered for is to go after the Legislature with regard to changing the regulations when it comes to building and that government agencies would have to abide by the rules and regulations in effect. This was before the Legislature a few years ago and, of

course, it got knocked down because these are the people that want to build whatever they want to be able to build. To get it passed is very, very difficult. It isn't the same rules, you are 100% correct and he didn't know how to affect that.

Chairman LeFebvre stated the Committee was starting to get a little adrift, the issue is not whether or not the Town government can exempt themselves from the rules but whether or not we want to do something with the letter. He would like everybody to keep focused on that particular point.

Bill Masters stated he wanted to clarify what he had said; when we get through this project, spending the money, it will not meet Codes; however, if you put an electrician in there to work on that, they have to by law bring that up to Code. There is no exception to that, you can not get an Engineer or an electrician to go in and do anything that does not meet the current existing standards; that building when it's renovated now and when they put in that electrical system and upgrade it based on the original, it will meet standards. That is absolutely a fact. Bob Drinkhall stated if we do this, all Safety Codes will be met. It's the other things such as seismic which isn't considered a safety per se, so the safety issues will be addressed. That's why the 3 that are so adamant are adamant about doing it right now and he didn't think anything the Committee said was really and truly going to change anything.

Ray Shakir stated he wanted to add a short tidbit to what Bill's dissertation was. No matter what you do with this building, you will never be able to bring it up to an equal longevity to a new building. If, for no other reason, you are dealing with an existing foundation that is at least 60 years old and that foundation is simply not going to last as long as a new, modern up to Code foundation. That is just not going to happen.

Chairman LeFebvre stated he was going to go around the table for one last comment for anyone who had one. Linda Teagan stated she would like to change "re-look" to "revisit" in the third paragraph. Joe Mosca stated he had nothing to add. Bill Aughton stated he had nothing to add. Doug Swett stated he thought that going the way they are going is a disaster. Ray Shakir stated he already said what he had to say. Bill Masters passed. John Edgerton stated he agreed with the letter and was in favor of it. John further wanted to make one comment about the Capital Reserve Funds that he makes every time it comes up: he is totally against all of the Capital Reserve Funds because that is current taxpayers paying for the future of somebody else to use the money and that's the wrong moral approach. You should pay for what you use, not pay now for 10 years from now. Bob Drinkhall stated he was here as a representative of the Select Board and they truly believe they're doing what is right. They are doing what they stated they would do right from the beginning. Chairman LeFebvre asked Bob to step down as the representative of the Select Board and tell the Committee how he personally felt about it. Bob stated he felt the way the members do but didn't see it would make any difference at this point in time. John stated what he was getting out of this was because the garage was turned down at the Town Meeting, the Selectmen feel now they have no choice but to spend \$200,000.00, \$300,000.00,

\$400,000.00, \$500,000.00 to make the building safe and the comment he gets from the public is they were not well enough informed that if the Bond was turned down, more money would be spent on the garage to try to keep it in Code than what it would cost to build a new garage. Chairman stated that may be the case; that's one of the reasons the letter was put together to give them another option and another chance to re-visit their decision. That is one of the reasons for doing the letter, to give them a chance to step back from the cliff and they don't have to play the Coyote and the Roadrunner going off the cliff.

Chairman LeFebvre stated he would change the letter as discussed and make sure it gets to the Town Hall tomorrow morning.

Chairman LeFebvre stated the another issue in front of the Committee is, as some are already aware, due to a financial hole being blown in his family's budget due to the contract his wife and he are working on, he is going to be phased out in September, he will have to resign as Budget Committee Chair in order to find suitable work to make up that hole. Mr. Sordi, as Vice Chairman would normally be the person the Chair would recommend to take over; however, Chair and David have spoken over the phone and he is extremely busy, on the road a lot and unable to do so. Therefore, we are faced with a decision of who we have left and is eligible and you have to be an elected member, not a Precinct member or a representative of the School Board or the Select Board in order to be Chairman. Bob Drinkhall stated he had asked someone who was quite knowledgeable if that is in fact the case and he did not believe that was so. Bob further asked if the Chair had doubled checked. Chairman advised he had checked with the Department of Revenue Administration. Chairman polled the members present for the position of Chair and no one was interested. Chairman further stated that Ms. Umberger who is a State Representative and will probably be re-elected for the State Representative job which means she will not be available for at least half of the meetings during the budget season because of the work in Concord; Mr. Masters has already discussed this with the Chairman and has indicated that he is not interested; Mr. Shakir has also expressed the same sentiment and Mr. Aughton stated he was not interested. Chairman further stated nothing against Joe Mosca and Linda Teagan, but he did not think the rookies should be considered. Chairman advised that at this time he would defer his resignation until absolutely necessary.

Chairman LeFebvre reminded everyone of the meeting on July 20th at 4:00 PM at Town Hall with members of the Select Board and the School Board to talk with the DRA; it is a DRA Workshop so that everyone can get a better feel for how we interface with the DRA. John Edgerton stated he was glad the DRA was going to be here because the Default Budget for the School included the \$1.6 Million which was a reduction in debt payment and he very firmly needs an opinion from DRA as to whether that can be included in the Default Budget.

Chairman LeFebvre stated that the Committee needed to be aware the School Board has directed the School Administration to look at a \$1 Million to \$1.5 Million cut in their current Operating Budget. There is a School Board meeting tomorrow night at 6:30 PM at the Kennett High School Auditorium. Chairman stated he would be there, Doug will be there as

usual, Mr. Masters was encouraged to be there and he encouraged all members to be at the meeting. Chairman stated that he had the entire Agenda of what was going to be discussed and if any one wanted to take a look at it, he would see that they received a copy.

Bill Masters stated he would like to discuss the Memo that he sent to Earl Sires with the Committee and to share what he has asked for.

Ray Shakir asked what happens if nobody wants the job as Chairman. Chairman LeFebvre stated he would recommend that it be done by committee and would recommend that the Chairship be rotated among two or three people so that no one is stuck doing it all the time. Chairman further stated that he recognizes, having done it himself, the amount of time and effort that it does take during the actual season. John Edgerton stated could go for co-Chairs and alternates.

Doug Swett stated the material Bill (Masters) forwarded to Earl Sires; wouldn't it be better to forward it to the Chairman of the Selectmen. Chairman LeFebvre stated Bill did this as a private citizen and as a private citizen he could send it to the Town Manager for his edification and how he did this was his business. When Bill sent this, he did not know that Earl was on vacation, so it has been sitting in Earl's e-mail and won't be addressed until Earl returns next week. Bob Drinkhall asked if the questions were what Bill wanted answered and the reason Bob mentioned this is that the acting Town Manger is Paul DegliAngeli and if these are the questions, Paul D. would be answering these anyhow and all that would have to be done is give it to Paul D. and he'll get an answer as soon as he is ready to give it. Doug stated as a private citizen, he would suggest that Mr. Masters take it tomorrow morning and give it to Paul D.; he had good intentions and Earl's on vacation, if the Town Engineer is going to have it, why not give it to him tomorrow.

Bill Aughton stated he was interested in the Chairman's comment concerning the School cut recommendation; who made the suggestion and how much was it. Chairman LeFebvre stated the School Board has requested the Administration to look at what the impact would be of a \$1 Million cut and a \$1.5 Million cut. They have exempted Special Education and Maintenance; everything else is on the table. Chairman stated Dr. Nelson put out a Memo to his people that states to reduce the impact on education as much as possible which makes sense to a degree.

Bill Masters stated the idea behind his Memo to Earl was to glean as much information so that we could make an informative decision as we possibly could and to look at all the costs and do a cost comparison over the life expectancy of the old facility versus the new facility with the thought in mind that we're the taxpayers advocate, is it cost efficient to pour this money into a building; the condition and age of the existing garage versus putting the money into a new facility. The idea behind this was to glean enough supporting information based upon the information he had and, after reviewing this, he was sure once the responses come in there may be other questions or other Committee members may have questions based upon this. His request was to have the response in writing so we would have some hard core figures to share amongst ourselves and perhaps discuss with the Selectmen if we can arrange to have it on the Agenda on

July 13th which is prior to the receipt of the bids themselves. Chairman LeFebvre stated the opening of the bids is July 13th. Bill stated he wanted to share the Memo with the Committee. Chairman stated he thought Doug (Swett) made an excellent suggestion or recommendation and asked Doug to repeat same. Doug stated as a private citizen, it would be a good idea for Bill to take the Memo to Paul D. tomorrow morning. Bill stated he had taken it to Paul D. where Earl was on vacation this week. Bill wanted the Committee to be aware of what he had done as a citizen so that the Committee wouldn't be broadsided or if somebody comes out with "the Committee is doing this", that wasn't his intent. Bill is hoping that the Committee will endorse a lot of the concepts, add to it as seen fit and request that we get a response from the Selectmen in writing so that we clearly know what the entire cost of the complete project would be and do a cost comparison that we could go to the taxpayers and say "here's what it is going to cost to do this building completely up to Code"; the old building versus the new building.

Chairman LeFebvre stated what he would like to do is recommend the following to the Committee: 1) that we ask the Select Board representative to have the June 30th letter that we just approved put on the discussion on the July 13th Board of Selectmen Agenda; secondly, as a group in order to speed this process through a little quicker, endorse Mr. Masters' private citizen questions and ask them to also respond to those on July 13th in writing.

Doug Swett asked if the 13th was the next Selectmen's meeting and that was the day the bids were being opened. Chairman LeFebvre stated they do not have to accept the bids even though they get opened. Doug asked what if they accept it before they read this. Chairman stated they are not going to have that opportunity. Ray Shakir stated just for clarification so that people understand what the bidding process is all about, even if they accept a bid to a certain contractor, the bid is subject to an award so they can accept a bid but they don't have to award the job.

Bill Aughton asked if the Budget Committee had a budget. Chairman LeFebvre stated the budget consists of the Recording Secretary's salary costs, \$100.00 to the Chair which is usually spent on food for the Saturday meeting and that's it. Bill asked how do we present anything to the voters other than through The Daily Sun or through the TV; that's always been his issue and it's one that you've brought up here. How do we tell people what the real deal is here. John Edgerton stated we need an advertising business. Chairman stated John's point about advertising is a good one but you can not advertise as a government agency; what you can do is inform, that's how the School Board does its thing with the voter's guide every year and the Select Board did try in some way, shape or form to inform the public. Bob Drinkhall stated absolutely; they did Drive Time which was Larry and Earl; it was brought up at every meeting; it was explained to the public; encouraged the newspaper to go forward. A good point is that we don't have newspaper coverage at our meetings, the Budget Committee. Chairman LeFebvre stated some may have seen him on Channel 3 interviewing various candidates; there is absolutely nothing to stop any member from doing individual produced shows. For example, he could interview Mr. Drinkhall on the Town Garage and Bob could explain his position as two citizens just talking back and forth which would be

another way to get the word out; recognize we don't have the best PR campaign because we have no budget, but there are other ways to get the word out. Bill stated to Bob, you may have done all those things and he saw almost nothing; the only thing that he saw that was really good was way too late to present and that was in the back of the Town Report and it was a real nice piece.

Bill Masters stated that was a very valid point and the reason we probably lost the garage this last time is because we didn't get our acts together and get out and say "hey, look public, this is what it costs you". There is nothing stopping any member from picking up a pen and writing down factual information, hate this speculation stuff, but if you've got a written report which says it is going to cost this to do this for the old building and it costs this to do this for the new building, we have an obligation to sit down as a citizen and say "hey, look public".

Chairman LeFebvre moved, seconded by Bill Aughton, to incorporate Mr. Master's questions to Earl as a position of the Budget Committee that we'd like these answers by the next Select Board meeting of July 13th. In favor: 7; Opposed: 0; Abstain: 2 - Bill Masters and Bob Drinkhall.

Ray Shakir stated he would like to respectfully disagree with Bill. There was something called the Garage Committee formed; people forget about that; we did formulate a complete cost review of the construction costs for a new garage and a written report was filed, so the numbers are there. Everybody had the numbers, maybe it was not publicized properly which is definitely the case, but the numbers were there. In fact, he presented it so he knows the numbers were there. All governing bodies know exactly what the cost of a new garage will be. Bob Drinkhall stated it is beyond his comprehension how anybody could not have heard this; not only did they have the things he had mentioned earlier, but also had a televised tour of the old garage. He heard it so many times he can't imagine how somebody in California didn't hear about it. Maybe it wasn't done properly somewhere along the line, but it was over and over and over and over again. He didn't know how, other than going door-to-door, how you could do any more than what was done.

John Edgerton stated he agreed; the new garage was well covered on what it was going to cost and everything else. What he never got was what was going to happen if it was turned down, how much money would it take to put that piece of junk back in shape. It appears nobody really looked that it was going to cost twice as much as the new garage.

Bill Aughton stated one of the things that has been mentioned, and he thought it was a big thing, is to have a consensus between the Selectmen and this group. If we are going to keep pushing this, need to get those two groups together. Consensus is what we need to do this, without it we don't have public support. John Edgerton stated there was consensus and it wasn't advertised very well. The Selectmen agreed in entirety we needed a new garage. The Budget Committee agreed we needed a new garage. The quibbling screwed it all up. All they heard was the quibbling on both sides, not that both committees agreed they really needed a garage. Bill

stated he voted against the first vote for the garage because he would not vote for something the Selectmen couldn't agree on.

Doug Swett stated on the 9th of May we lost a member of this Committee and we haven't had a meeting since even though we tried to have one and didn't have a quorum. Doug thought a moment of silence was in order to respect Patricia Libby who passed away very suddenly. Chairman LeFebvre stated a personal note on Pat, she was one of the people when he first came on the Budget Committee who took him aside and said "hey, listen to Doug Swett and the rest of the people that have been there for awhile, they know what's going on". She will be missed, she was a tremendous lady, and a tremendous asset to this Committee.

Bob Drinkhall stated he had a comment regarding the School. In preparation for the meeting that wasn't, he wanted to pass the following along and maybe get some feedback. It truly bothers him the amount of money spent on what he considers non-education. The cost of Special Ed for example, he'd like to know what possibly could be done if we found a better way to handle Special Ed and even if that meant losing other State Aid would we gain or would we lose. The number of students involved in the 221 suspensions that are mentioned in the Report Card that we got at the non-meeting; how many people, was it one person suspended; don't have 221 days of school so it would have to be at least two people, but 221 suspensions, he doesn't remember that in all the years he was in school. What he was getting at is what portion of education's lack of success do you contribute to poor parenting and poor behavior. The Report Card shows that Grade 11, there's 4 levels, 1, 2, 3 and 4; one being 95% on Math, writing 85%; with all the programs and the lowering of requirements, we still end up with these poor results. This is unbelievable, it's unacceptable. His opinion is we should eliminate all or most of the programs and non-essentials and concentrate on the basics, saving money and obtaining better results with stricter requirements. Bob asked if he was shooting for something that was totally impossible. As an example, he bought a lunch for under \$10.00 and the cashier was reasonably dressed for the position, reasonably well mannered and reasonably intelligent looking and he handed her a \$10.00 or \$20.00 bill and all of a sudden she has a cell phone out and when she saw the quizzical expression on his face, she said she had put in the wrong amount tendered on the register and she had no idea how to make change. This was somebody that was definitely beyond High School at this point in time. She had to use her cell phone as an adding machine just to calculate the change; where are we headed; what are we doing.

Chairman LeFebvre stated those that have attended the School Board meetings know for a fact that the Conway School District is a District in need of improvement. In order to do that, you have to fail certain parameters for 2 years in a row. You also know for a fact that the SAT scores at Kennett High School have gone down 3 years in a row, all of which buttresses Bob's earlier commentary. He would agree that we need to take a more definitive look at the School District and ask them to look and discuss their curriculum in more detail, recognizing that we are advisors and not in the position to dictate change to them.

John Edgerton stated he'd like to take the other side, although he agrees where the Chairman is going and he thought the average student graduating from all schools throughout the country is deplorable; but when you are stressed with the point of how many students you're going to keep in school who shouldn't be there because they don't want to be there versus academic qualifications, you're diluting everything just to keep them in school and that's got to be the system. Chairman LeFebvre stated we are not educating, we are holding them in a holding pattern until they reach the age of 18, is that your larger point. John Edgerton stated he agreed with that, he would agree with it to the point where the Schools now raise our children whether we want them to or not because the parents won't or can't.

Doug Swett stated they are pushing to go Pre-Kindergarten because that's when they say they can learn faster. He brought it up a long time ago to them and said Nazi Germany did that and it worked very well; they got the parents out of the picture and they brainwashed the kids. Chairman LeFebvre stated at this point, they can't handle their primary mission and Pre-K is an additional mission; if they can't handle their primary mission, they shouldn't be trying to establish a new mission on top of one that is already a failure; that's just his personal opinion.

Ray Shakir stated a partial explanation along what Bob was talking about. Common sense is the answer to that question of why it's been deteriorating is technology. The problem with the change is that you don't go into a store today where the register doesn't tell you what the change is. When we were growing up and standing behind the cash register, you had to figure out in your head, you even had to figure out if they gave you an extra \$.03. One of the things Bob said was writing; what goes with writing is penmanship. He was always impressed generally speaking on a female's handwriting, it always blew him away that for some reason girls' handwriting always looked better than guys' handwriting. For example, he had gotten some thank you cards from nieces and the handwriting was terrible; the first thing he did was open up and asked who was writing the card and he found it to be a girl's handwriting and his wife said they don't write anymore, everything is computer, everything is texting; they don't pick up a pen anymore, they don't use script anymore, they just don't do it anymore so naturally the handwriting is going to be terrible and it's all one word "technology".

Linda Teagan stated she didn't want to get too far off field with the School, but since we are the Budget Committee, she would think that over the next several years there are going to be cuts required because the money just isn't there and it's been a long time since she has done this, but she thought Special Ed is a federal issue. She's been involved the past couple of years with a group that raises money for the schools and she ended up on the Scholarship Committee and it was really impressive how much the people on that committee looked at the Math grades. When it comes time for the cuts, we just need to make sure that the cuts are in administration fluff or whatever. She knows that a lot of times you hear that it is so wonderful because the school is so big and they have such a variety of classes. She has found that sometimes the more expensive schools have less variety; you walk in and there it is, you take English, Math, Science, History and Language. There has to be something we can add

to this to make sure arguably that the education could be better with less money and fewer people. It's been awhile since she's been thinking about these things, but there's no reason why this school system can not excel because there's no issue as far as she can tell with "English as a second language" which takes up an awful lot of money in other school systems. We've got a homogeneous population, we've got small communities, we should be able to do well with the basics.

Doug Swett stated what's happened here is the deeper the government got into education, the worse the performance has been and then they say if we had more money, we could do better and the first thing you know we're going to be running around here with a pair of earrings and slippers on and we won't have anything else.

Bob Drinkhall stated he left out one important part of the equation and that is the fact that on top of the poor results we're obtaining, in 2007 teachers in the highest which is the distinguished level were 102, 2008 had 106, 2009 had 11; that's out of 180. Now how is it that that many are distinguished and yet the students are doing that poorly. It just makes no sense whatsoever.

Chairman LeFebvre stated several folks and he had talked about different things and one thing he was interested in taking a look at was having the administration and the School Board identify what they consider to be their critical core courses, their important courses, and the courses that if everything else were to be looked at, they could do away with or out source. For example: several AP courses might be taught by people who work at Granite State University. They could be acting as adjunct professors which would be considerably less expensive potentially than having a teacher at \$40,000.00 a year teach those courses for one or two people, because those courses are taught for a small group and that teacher is doing that as opposed to concentrating on the critical and the important courses. Chairman further stated he fully admires and fully supports AP courses because when he left his High School he had a semester of college under his belt and it saved a lot of money. Potentially there are better ways to do it rather than have a teacher at Kennett High School do it, give it to an adjunct professor out of Granite State. What we are saying, he believes, is we are looking at the School Board and the administration and saying it's time to stop using the same day-to-day approach, think outside the box. Chairman wished the representative from the School Board were here, unfortunately she is absent and he will make a point of talking to her tomorrow at the School Board meeting.

Bill Masters stated that's a very valid point because the School chews up anywhere from 65% to 70% of the tax rate base. If the taxpayers are paying for something that's really not up to snuff and it's sucking up 65% of the tax rate, we really need to look at that because we are the taxpayers advocate and are they getting their money's worth in terms of performance, do we have copies of their job descriptions, do we have copies of their evaluation criteria. Chairman LeFebvre stated there are certain things we have to be careful with when we look at this stuff; asking for individual evaluations and things of that nature may very well fall under individual privacy act issues. What we can do, as Bob

mentioned, you have 180 teachers and 110 are considered superior or exemplary or whatever term is used to indicate they are the best and the brightest; if we have 111 best and brightest, to what do we attribute the fact that we have the test scores and the failures that we are seeing in the Report Card, the District need of improvement and the falling SAT Scores. You have a problem here, ladies and gentlemen of the School Board which you need to address and that is where he would suggest is where we start rather than getting into sometimes what might be considered the minutiae, approach it from the macro level as opposed to digging in too deep; he agrees that we need to dig but we need to make sure that we don't dig and violate individual rights. Bill stated that wasn't his question, his question was we should be able to have for the teachers are doing such and such, not by name, not individual but they must have performance standards for that 2nd Grade, 3rd Grade teacher whatever that happens to be and they must have an evaluation criteria. Bill didn't care for names, but if you're a public official you'd better be able to share the performance standards and they are available. Chairman stated that is something at the next meeting or the August meeting if he was still the Chair to put together a letter to the School Board asking for things of that nature.

Bob Drinkhall asked if it would be helpful for him to go to the meeting tomorrow night and brought up what he has said tonight; would it do any good. Chairman LeFebvre stated the more we put pressure on the School Board and the administration that the fun and games is over, we will have an impact. Chairman reminded everyone that the next School Board meeting was at 6:30 PM tomorrow night at the Kennett High School Auditorium and he encouraged the public who watches Valley Vision or hears about it to be there.

Bob Drinkhall stated one of his other cost savings attempts has been to turn off lights, street lights in town, that have no apparent reason for being where they are. That's how he started out and it ended up that they turned off the ones south of Artist Falls on Route 16; that wasn't necessarily his intent at that time; his intent was to turn off the one's that seemed to be randomly placed in neighborhoods where in fact there are no sidewalks, crosswalks and obviously in neighborhoods where there are no businesses. Currently they have a program going, calling WMUR and doing Drive Time but it seems that the feedback they are getting already of course, is "not in my neighborhood". Chairman LeFebvre stated it is so important to have a street light. Bob further stated that by turning off 120 to 140 lights, we'll save \$15,000.00 a year and no one can explain why they are located where they are because somebody years and years ago requested it and somebody else said yes.

Linda Teagan stated Mr. Drinkhall seems to have a lot of accumulated information on the number of teachers and some of the other things that he read off. Would it be possible to just put a paragraph on a piece of paper so that we can have it when that comes down the road and we have the joint meetings. It's good information and it's specific information and we'll lose it if it isn't put in some form. Bob Drinkhall stated it will be in the Minutes. Chairman LeFebvre stated that's one source, however, if you want, Bob and the Chair could work together doing that because last year he asked the School District to provide a listing of

the teachers and he did an analysis of their salaries and benefits which he provided to all members of the Budget Committee last year. He intends to ask the School Board for the exact same information again this year because he found that information fascinating and to the extent that a \$28,000.00 a year teacher, when you figure in their school benefits and their health insurance, costs \$45,000.00 per person. Linda stated the other thing that is always of interest is how many non-teaching positions there are because if you're trying to arguably give these kids an extra bit of Math or an extra bit of Language instruction, it would be nice if the Vice Principals or Principals would teach at least one course; maybe that's forbidden, she had not idea but at least we could ask the question and find out.

Chairman LeFebvre stated at one of the School Board meetings very recently the Vice Principal of Kennett High School announced he was resigning. One of the School Board members asked the Principal of Kennett High School if they could forego the Vice Principal position for a year based on the fact that they had other supervisors in the building and the Principal was adamant in saying that he needed that person because of the things that the Vice Principal did as far as discipline was concerned which is one of the reasons Mr. Drinkhall brought up those 221 suspensions made by 221 people or some people may have been suspended one, two, three, four or five times, that number is uncertain. The fact of the matter is that was his rationale for saying he absolutely needed this person. Just as a side line, when this person who is leaving was hired, he replaced someone who had been a Principal in Massachusetts and was earning \$58,000.00 a year plus benefits. To hire this new person who is now leaving, they paid him over \$60,000.00 and when he came in his entire experience was as an intern in a school in New Hampshire. Doug Swett stated he has left to go to an area where his wife is teaching and he is going to be getting a big raise by leaving; can't blame him. Chairman stated he is going to be earning approximately \$85,000.00; can't blame him for leaving either.

Bob Drinkhall moved, seconded by Bill Aughton and Bill Masters, to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 PM. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Iris A. Bowden, Recording Secretary