



Town of Weare NEW HAMPSHIRE

Town of Weare Finance Committee

January 24th, 2024, 6:30pm

Members			
X	Tom Clow (Chair)	X	John Merva
X	Elizabeth Evans	X	Maria Fossiano (Secretary)
X	Neal Kurk	X	Bill Anderson
X	James Drury	X	Tom Flaherty
X	Karie Tepper (Vice Chair)	X	Lori Davis
X	Jessica Kallipolites		
Guests/Speakers			
	Jon Morton (Town Moderator)	X	Naomi Bolton (Town Administrator)
X	Sergeant Brandon Montplaisir	X	Officer Barry Charest

Agenda Topic		Discussion
1.	Police Collective Bargaining Agreement Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tom Clow- "Is there anything in the contract, like any changes beyond the 5%?" Sergeant Montplaisir responded- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is some new language on discipline based on case law, all administrative There is also the possibility of getting dental insurance, right now the Police Department does not provide Dental Insurance, they can purchase it at 100% Weare is one of the only Police Departments in the state of New Hampshire that does not offer any contribution for Dental Insurance. Not a guarantee that we get it, Police Department would only get it if it were offered to other Town Employees at the same rate Town Employees also do not get Dental Insurance Neal Kurk- "So there is no Dental Insurance in the contract and if Dental Insurance was included, it would need to be in a future town warrant?" Sergeant Montplaisir responded- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correct, unclear on the process but would need to be approved by the town body Language in the contract would say that if this is offered to Town Employees, the police department would receive the same benefits Sergeant Montplaisir continued- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language was also included for longevity bonuses, there was no language in the contract, but it is in Town Personnel Policy, so after 10 years you get a 250-dollar stipend, and after 15 years it is a 500 dollar stipend. Contract was silent on this prior

- The union and the town wanted to be financially responsible
- A Sergeants pay in Weare is in the bottom 25% of pay in the NH, same with patrol officers
- Received an 8% pay increase last year, needed the increase to get officers to Weare
- Weare now has a fully staffed Police Department, not many police departments are fully staffed in NH
- Would like to keep officers in Weare, Town invests a lot of money to get officers trained
- Police Department will be able to be competitive against local agencies, just not big cities
- Office Barry Charest added- Contract is important for retention, Weare has a phenomenal Police Department at this time and Department wants to maintain them
- Tom Flaherty asked – *“So this contract is 5%, then 5% next year, and 5% after that? 15% over 3 years?”*
 - Correct
- Tom Flaherty- *“That would total to \$200,854 over 3 years, I am assuming that the folks getting these raises are not included in any of the other articles?”*
 - That is correct
- Tom Clow responded- Everyone else is non-union that is why there is separate articles
- Tom Flaherty commented- This would be \$17.74 for 350,00 dollar home this year
- Sergeant Montplaisir added- If you own a 400,000 house under this warrant your tax rate would go up roughly 60 dollars at the end of the 3rd year
- Neal Kurk commented- First year is a nickel on the tax bill 17.75 per 350,000 house, 2nd year would be twice that, 34, and the 3rd year I would pay an extra 51 dollar for 350,000
- Lori Davis asked- *“Contracts are a give and take, you get 5% what did we get?”*
- Sergeant Montplaisir responded - You have got a fully staffed, knowledgeable Police Department, which can self-sustain and wants to serve this community. Police Department had been behind since 2009
- Neal Kurk - One of the issues with the contract is that the town is trying to give the non-union labor the same increase that the union labor gets. So, this year the cost of living is 3.2%, the police are getting 5% and the Town Employees are getting 5%. Next year the police will get 5% but inflation will go down. Town employees will be getting wages much higher than the cost of living increases. There is a consequence to this contract that goes beyond giving the police department money.
- Tom Clow added- I understand what you are saying but it is speculation, it is up to the Board of Selectmen to decide what they are going to offer whether it is 3% or 5%. We should look at side effects of articles whether it is the schools or police. It is true that we’ve gone years without being able to have a full staff. One of the things that this will do is keep the people that we have as of 2 weeks ago finally hit full staff. It is the dollars and cents that we are concerned with, but we do have a responsibility to look at what is being accomplished with these articles. This article would assist in maintaining a full staff.
- Sergeant Montplaisir added- Seasoned officers offer risk mitigation, unfortunately people get sued. We have a great Police Chief who can help train and mentor the new officers. We aren’t paying all these lawsuits that we paid years ago.
- Bill Anderson mentioned- 5% each of the 3 years, is reasonable because we are getting retention now, the 8% bumped it up to a place where they are able to get to a level playing field now. It is the same as what the non-union employees are getting, may carry on but right now it is reasonable. We don’t know where inflation is going, may stick

		<p>around for a while. Different than what we got in the Teachers' Contract, was much higher, and that is why we said no to that. Reasonable for people in a field that is very hard to hire into right now</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lori Davis asked- <i>"Are we discussing this as approval of the warrant article?"</i> • Tom Clow asked- <i>"How does the committee want to go through these articles, are we going to take them as we heard them and do the vote?"</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We do not have a lot of time left to review warrants. We could vote on this or do later tonight • Neal K responded- Prefers to vote later tonight and believes we should go in order of the articles. We have to review the school blurbs because Bill has provided the blurbs • Lori Davis mentioned- We generally do not review articles in front of the people who are presenting them. • Tom Clow responded-It is my job to stop comments from the audience once we've started deliberations. • Karie Tepper added- I would like to go through all the articles to discuss them before we vote • Tom Flaherty added- <i>"In fairness to these gentlemen, we have not had a lot of deliberation on this, the sense of the committee last week was we could reconsider our vote on any article as things evolve in the process, is that still true?"</i> • Maria Fossiano mentioned- I believe based on the past minutes that Neal said it would have to be in the meeting following the meeting where the decision was made • Tom Clow responded- I actually disagree, that would be if we were following Roberts rules, and we are not going by Roberts rules
2.	Review of School Warrants Blurbs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Clow mentioned- Has additional information we wanted to provide involving the Teachers Contract, He was curious about the 4 positions that were cut, what they were worth, so he called Jackie Coe. Jackie let Tom know that they use an 87,000 figure, which would amount to approximately 350k. He also asked how this ties in with the present contract, what remains and what doesn't. Language of the contract stays the same, salaries would be frozen if contract doesn't pass, Teachers would not move up any steps. Cannot go back to old contract to determine steps up. • Lori Davis asked- <i>"On the figures that Jackie gave you, was she saying that all 4 teachers get paid 87k a year?"</i> • Tom Clow responded- no, that is the average that they look at, just the figure that they use, included benefits and retirement. There would be a slight drop in salary because of the insurance going up. The teacher's portion of the insurance would go up so the paycheck going home would be somewhat less than it would be this year because of that what that insurance premium going up. These are factors that we need to take into consideration, what does cutting 4 positions and freezing everyone's salaries do to the school district? • John Merva asked- <i>"Are there options to deal with this? Or is it strictly yay or nay?"</i> • Tom Clow responded- No options, it is strictly, yay or nay. Negotiation has already been done. • Neal Kurk asked- <i>"Is it not true that if the district can find enough money in the budget, they could give the teachers a step increase even if there is no contract?"</i>

- Tom Clow responded- Doesn't know, can't answer it. Could do it perhaps, Police Departments have used Memorandums of Understanding, maybe could be done between the Union and the School District
- Lori Davis mentioned- We represent the taxpayers, she is receiving emails that if taxes go up like they did last year, folks will need to move out of town

Article 3- Weare School District

- Neal Kurk commented- What Bill wrote is excellent, it describes exactly the situation. I do have one change that I'd like to suggest in the last sentence. It says in future budget cycle to committee encourages the district to look for additional teacher and support staff positions within the schools and SAUs. He believes administrative positions should be added. Discussion included the recommendation that administrative positions be looked at. School district shouldn't deal with declining student population by just cutting teachers positions.
- James Drury added- You could likely get away with saying look for additional teacher, support staff, and administrative positions in both schools and the SAU.
- Bill Anderson added- I thought administrative staff was covered by the support staff.
- Neal Kurk- No, support staff is different than administrative staff, support staff would be Paras and Janitors
- Committee voted unanimously to approve the changes to the blurb

Article 4- Weare Teachers Contract

- Neal Kurk commented- Recommending changing some words, increase cost to taxpayers in the first year of the contract \$ 901,786 in salaries and benefits which would have a tax impact of \$244 on a 350,000 property.
- Bill Anderson added - I believe I removed the word over, are you looking at the document that was passed out?
- Neal Kurk added- no, update is fine.

Article 4- John Stark Support Staff

- Neal Kurk commented- The last word of the blurb should be essential positions not services
- Karie Tepper added- For consistency purpose, add a space in year one
- Neal Kurk commented- He did some calculations that he would like to share, he looked at the percentage change in inflation for the past 11 years, came out to 23% in change and he looked at the Weare School Budget over that same period of time and that came out to 33% change. So, while inflation was going up 23% over the past decade the school budget was going up 33% at a time when the student population was dropping. Supported his suspicion that the school budget was growing faster than inflation
- Tom Clow added- I think it's important that we let every article on its own merit, want to do justice to each article as we discuss it. Articles have effects beyond the financial aspect of them.

3.	Town Warrant Deliberation	<p>Article 7: Town Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Clow commented- We've heard a lot about this, we've had presentations from every department, and many of us were at the Public Hearing. Please keep the conversation moving. We have total expenditures, anticipated revenues, and the amount to be raised by taxation. • Neal Kurk commented- I would like to throw out some numbers, budget increases as in the total amount being spent, the tax rate impact, there are a variety of different ways to review. If you look at the total amount of the budget, 2024 budget was \$8,574,000. The 2023 budget, before warrant articles was \$7,977,00, that is a 7.5% increase. Voters voted 2 contracts in. So, if you compare the 2024 budget with the 2023 budget, adjusted for expenditure for those contracts it is a 5.4% increase. When you budget you get 8 million dollars, but you get 4 million in revenue, so taxpayers are only paying taxes on the 4 million you need to raise from them. In 2024, the amount we are going to be raising in taxes is \$4, 479,000, in 2023 we were raising \$4,052,000, that is a 10.5% increase in taxes for the Town Budget. If you compare the Default Budget in terms of the taxes, we have to raise to support that vs last year, it is a 2.2% increase. So, if we were to vote in favor of the Default Budget, we would be giving the taxpayers a 2.23% increase in their taxes. If we were to adopt the Proposed Budget vs the Default Budget, there is an extra 8.1% that the taxpayers would have to pick up. • Neal Kurk Continued- The consequences of going with the Default Budget, Selectmen have less money appropriated, but will they have less money to spend? Selectmen can increase the budget of departments as long as they don't exceed appropriations. If the Default Budget is adopted, money will not be spent in the Public Works Department budgeting for 12 positions, only 6 are filled. Assuming at least 3 don't get filled, 3 positions at 40k a year plus 20k in Healthcare Benefits, it is roughly 60k a position. If that is the case the Selectmen will have 270k left over. The cost of 3 dollars raise in the article is 70k, so if we adopt the Default Budget, Selectmen will have enough to pay the raises if that article passes. Money will be left over. He is very comfortable supporting the Default Budget, he believes there will be enough money for them to get what they need. • Lori Davis commented- I agree with you because every year these budgets all end up with money back. • Tom Clow commented- Disagrees with the concept of not funding positions that we know need to be filled. If we need 12 people in the Highway Department, we can budget for 6 and can't go shopping with no money in our pockets for the other 6 as the year progresses. As far giving raises late, unclear if we do that if you don't put it on the warrant as a separate article. • Naomi Bolton requested clarification- She does not understand Neal's math. Naomi thought he mentioned that in 2024 was a certain number and 2023 was a certain number. What did you use for 2023? • Neal Kurk Responded- 2023 approved \$4,052,621, on the bottom line on page 4. Then for the Proposed Budget in 2024, on page six he used \$4,479,244 and doing the math is comes out to 10.5%. • Naomi Bolton followed up- So you are not taking into consideration what was approved that has an effect on 2024? So, when Collective Bargaining was approved there was still 3 months left, on the bottom of 4, when people voted to approve collective bargaining and

pay increases there is still 3 months of 2024 because you only approved 9 so you knew there would be an additional amount of money

- Neal Kurk Responded- “Isn’t that included?” Let’s use tax dollars
- Naomi Bolton answered- Your estimated revenues are not apples to apples, so when the Town approved it they knew they were going to have \$8,187,527 dollars with the inclusion of Health Insurance Premiums, a decrease in debt service, and a decrease in the police pay roll. You aren’t adding what was approved and that is where we get to in 2024 because that is a result of the voting.
- Neal Kurk responded- I thought we were talking about the tax rate
- Naomi Bolton responded- You are using different Estimates Revenues, and a different Net Assessed Evaluation from year to year you are not using the same impact numbers. It is not apples to apples. Neal is not using the same Revenue or Net Assess Evaluation from 2023-2024.
- Neal Kurk responded- That is correct but what I am doing is looking at this as someone who pays property taxes, what you said is correct, but what I said is correct from the view of a taxpayer. The taxpayers are going to see their taxes go up by this amount.
- Naomi Bolton responded- We have 115k in insurance that we have to pay, and we hope to not have 6 people out on an icy night. Insurance is not included in the Default Budget. Insurance is 115k less in default than it is in the proposed.
- Neal Kurk responded- Those insurances are not included in the Default because they are not by contract?
- Naomi Bolton responded- Correct, in a pool, covers worker comp, liability, and unemployment
- Bill Anderson added- Difference between the Proposed and the Default is \$333,370.00. For a 350,000 dollar house the cost is 91 dollars. Need to determine whether we as a group think there is going to be 333k taken away that can be absorbed, and will there be enough flexibility in the budget? Last year we supported a Proposed Budget because we had gone a number of years without it.
- Tom Clow added- There are multiple contracts to consider not just the insurance benefits but anything from technology to lawn care that has to be made up somewhere. Last year looked like a big jump but the town was working off of a budget from 3 years before. So, when you look at the difference you need to take into consideration the spread there. At the end of the year Department Heads are encouraged in the last quarter of the year to hold on to their spending because the town doesn’t want to go out and borrow money through a tax anticipation note to get through the year. A surplus at the end of the year is used more often than not to offset taxes. He agrees the end of year surplus should be used on budget related items. There were things that should have been included in the Police Budget that were not included. \$91 dollar figure important because it’s not unaffordable to most people.
- Tom Flaherty added- But when you put it in perspective its 100 dollars on the current tax bill that folks are paying, and we haven’t reviewed the other 14 articles.

Article 7, Town Budget Vote

Neal Kurk motioned to support the proposed Town Budget; Lori Davis seconded the motion

Those in favor of the motion, James Drury, Tom Clow, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, and Maria Fossiano. (5)

	<p>Those who are opposed to the motion to support the proposed Town Budget, John Merva, Jessica Kallipolites, Elizabeth Evans, Lori Davis, Neal Kurk, and Bill Anderson. (6)</p> <p>Neal Kurk motioned that the committee does not recommend the Town Budget, Lori Davis seconded</p> <p>All those in favor of not recommending, John Merva, Jessica Kallipolites, Elizabeth Evans, Lori Davis, Neal Kurk, and Bill Anderson. (6)</p> <p>All those in opposition to not recommending, James Drury, Tom Clow, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, and Maria Fossiano. (5)</p> <p>Not recommended 6/5</p> <p>Article 8, Police Contract (CBA)</p> <p>Bill Anderson made a motion to recommend the Police Contract CBA, Maria Fossiano seconded the motion</p> <p>Those in favor of recommending Article 8 Police Contract CBA, James Drury, Tom Clow, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Maria Fossiano, John Merva, Jessica Kallipolites, Lori Davis, Neal Kurk, and Bill Anderson. (10)</p> <p>Those who are opposed to recommending Article 8 Police Contract, Elizabeth Evans. (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bill Anderson asked- Could I get a blurb for the mailer? • Elizabeth Evans responded- Inflation is expected to come down, and with the increase in crime rates occurring in cities/ urban environments that police officers' positions are actually in high demand in communities such as Weare. <p>Article 9, Raises Non-Union to include all except the Town Administrator</p> <p>Neal Kurk motioned to recommend Article 9, Raises Non-Union to include all except the Town Administrator, Tom Flaherty seconded the motion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maria Fossiano asked- Every job I've ever had I receive a review based on how I did that year, and my raise is based on performance, does that happen at the Town level? • Naomi Bolton responded- Department heads do their evaluations, evaluations have been done, 5% is to stay in line, it is a cost-of-living raise, there are still 3 Department Heads who have not had reviews yet, Police, DPW, and the Town Administrator. Reviews are done, unclear how raises will be calculated from there • Maria Fossiano asked- So, no matter what your evaluation is, folks get 5% across the board? • Naomi Bolton responded- Didn't say it that way, likely will be a pool, haven't heard the word pool. Had to come up with a number sum certain, needed a mathematical way of doing it. 5% matched the 5% with the police.
--	---

- Neal Kurk followed up- *"Has there ever been a year when you were here when there wasn't a uniform X% raise? For example, one person had a great year got a 6% raise and a person review was poor, and they got a 2% raise?"*
- Naomi Bolton responded- Naomi recalls a year the town did that, Town has done that but doesn't remember what year. Last few years it has been across the board. Board is working on job descriptions now, and department heads created evaluation forms
- Bill Anderson asked- If this article gets approved the limit is 130k?
- Naomi Bolton responded- Per year, yes, 98k is for the 9 months
- Karie Tepper requested clarification- The performance-based increases are separate and are within the current budget?
- Naomi Bolton responded- No, every year we come back and there has been that discussion, do we need to, but we feel it's been this way for a while. You could get a great evaluation and still get zero because raise determined by taxpayers or get you a percentage.
- Lori Davis asked- We gave them a 4% raise during covid, they've gotten 4% consistently
- Naomi Bolton responded- It is actually typically 3%
- Lori Davis commented- Town employees are ahead of social security
- Naomi Bolton responded- We actually looked at that, they are actually behind, because one-year social security got 8.9% and Town only got 3%
- Lori Davis commented- A lot of private companies are not giving raises or COLA increases
- Naomi Bolton added- We have given town employees a 3% raise, but they had to kick in 10% for their insurance
- Neal Kurk added- *"As I read the article it states everyone will get the 5% COLA increase, so everyone gets the 5%?"*
- Naomi Bolton responded- Yes, a 5% COLA increase

All those in favor of recommending Article 9

Those in favor of Article 9, Neal Kurk, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Tom Flaherty, Bill Anderson, and Tom Clow (6)

Those who are against recommending Article 9, Elizabeth Evans, Lori Davis, Maria Fossiano, James Drury, and Karie Tepper (5)

- Neal Kurk asked for Elizabeth's reasoning
- Elizabeth Evans Responded- Looking at inflation, the prior cost of living adjustments, police increase didn't matter

Article 10, DPW Department Wage Adjustment

- Tom Clow mentioned- It is a flat 3 dollar an hour raise for each position in the DPW, step one, compounds through the steps
- Naomi Bolton mentioned- The highest someone would get is \$3.48, raise specific to step one
- Lori Davis asked- *"Didn't the DPW get a bonus this year?"*
- Tom Clow responded- Bonus was for anybody who signed on to work from November 15th- April 15th, received at bonus and that bonus was \$250 a week
- Lori Davis asked- Are they part of the 5% COLA?

- Naomi Bolton Responded- Was a sign on bonus for snowplows

Lori Davis motioned to recommend Article 10 DPW Wage Adjustment, Jessica Kallipolites seconded the motion

- Neal Kurk commented- He is going to vote against this article because he believes there is more than enough money in the Default Budget for the Selectmen to provide a 6k raise if they wish to do so with money that would be available in the default budget. It is necessary to raise the wages for these folks, but the question is now
- Bill Anderson commented- He is in favor of the article, they have been down people, they have about half the staff, if you drive through other towns this is a problem. You can put band aids on it, borrow funds, or contract out but the way to solve the problem is to fill the positions filled. Best way to get positions filled and this is one article where you need the extra bump. Chronic problem.

Those in favor of recommending Article 10, DPW Department Wage Adjustment, Elizabeth Evans Bill Anderson, Tom Clow, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, James Drury, Karie Tepper, and Maria Fossiano (8)

Those not in favor of recommending Article 10, DPW Department Wage Adjustment Neal Kurk, Tom Flaherty, and Lori Davis (3)

Article 11 Fire Department Wage Adjustment

James Drury made a motion to recommend Article 11 Fire Department Wage Adjustment, Lori Davis Seconded

- Neal Kurk commented- I can't support this, it means these folks are getting an 11% increase, 5% on the COLA, and then approximately 6% here. If this department was down people over a period of time and was struggling to get personnel maybe this would be a good idea. The department is fully staffed, no urgency to do something. Selectmen were hesitant about it but agreed to put on the warrant to let the voters decide.
- Elizabeth Evans added- It does seem like there are a lot of increases and it is not necessary because they are fully staffed, there doesn't seem to be any turnover issues.
- John Merva asked- Does the 5% COLA increase apply to these folks?
 - Yes
- Tom Flaherty added- I am against this because I think 5% increase is a good step that is why he voted against the DPW as well. He didn't get the sense that this was well thought out.
- Bill Anderson mentioned- He doesn't support the article, all positions are filled, and they have 3 per diem positions that they can draw from if they are down people. 5% in the other article is sufficient.

Those in favor of Article 11 Fire Department Wage Adjustment- no committee members

Those not in favor of recommending Article 11 Fire Department Wage Adjustment - Neal Kurk, Tom Flaherty, and Lori Davis Elizabeth Evans, Bill Anderson, Tom Clow, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, James Drury, Karie Tepper, and Maria Fossiano

Maria Fossiano motioned to not recommend Article 11 Fire Department Wage Adjustment, Lori Davis Seconded

Those in favor of not recommending Article 11 Fire Department Wage Adjustment, Neal Kurk, Tom Flaherty, and Lori Davis Elizabeth Evans, Bill Anderson, Tom Clow, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, James Drury, Karie Tepper, and Maria Fossiano

Those in favor of not not recommending Article 11 Fire Department Wage Adjustment- no committee members

Article 12, Full time Library Position

James Drury made a motion to recommend Article 12, Full time Library Position, Lori Davis Seconded the motion

- Neal Kurk commented- He asked for job descriptions of the Library Director and the Assisting Director, and it was provided. The Library Director among other things has certain requirements, psychical, knowledge requirement, and a master's degree in American Library Associated Accredited Institution. There are no such requirements for the Assistant Director. Neal doesn't believe we need an Assistant Director as a formal position. In the past it took a while to hire Clay, in the interterm a part time person was acting director as a part time and was able to do the job. Making a part timer, full time, doesn't change the fact that there are no qualifications. Town not getting a benefit from making this a full-time position. Neal will not be supporting this article.
- Lori Davis added- Clay mentioned at Selectmen's Meeting that the employee deserved to be fulltime, Lori doesn't disagree about rewarding employees, but you shouldn't create a full time position because you want to give the employee something more. Part time positions would be better than fulltime because of benefits
- Elizabeth Evans added- If there are no additional credentials to justify the increase then it doesn't change the effect on the town. It would have a negative effect because the town would be paying more for the same thing.
- Bill Anderson- In fairness to Clay, they did ask him that and he said there was an increased use of the library, this position would add 6 hours
- Tom Clow asked- If we added a part time employee would there need to be a warrant article?
 - Naomi Bolton responded- No, Library is governed by trustees
- Karie Tepper asked-*"You said this position would add 6 hours and there is enough increase work to justify the 6 hours?"*
- Bill Anderson responded- Yes, it is a part time position now, and he would add 8 hours, position going from 32-38. Unclear if the work has increased to justify the 6 hours. He had supporting comments.

- Elizabeth Evans commented- My understanding is that they can also use private funds to make this person full time, instead of taking it from taxpayer dollars.

Those in favor of recommending Article 12, Full time Library Position, no committee members

Tom Flaherty made a motion to not recommend Article 12, Full time Library Position, Jessica Kallipolites seconded the motion - Neal Kurk, Tom Flaherty, Lori Davis, Elizabeth Evans, Bill Anderson, Tom Clow, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, James Drury, Karie Tepper, and Maria Fossiano

Article 13, Police Cruiser

James Drury made a motion to recommend Article 13 Police Cruiser, Neal Kurk seconded the motion.

- Tom Clow commented- The Chief has done all he could in the last year to go out for grants and bring in money that is not taxpayer money for equipment. In this case there is an offsetting amount that doesn't come out of the fund balance but comes out of the money the department has taken in. Chief able to get a grant that totally covered the cost of a commend vehicle
- Tom Flaherty added- I like the Chief's planning and I like getting away from the Dodge Chargers, but he is looking ahead at other things he believes are critical, this something that can wait
- Bill Anderson commented- He doesn't support the article, last year the number of cruisers in allowance is above what is really needed. They've been operating without a Dodge Charger for a while. The Police Department has been operating adequately with existing vehicles.
 - If article doesn't pass Chief would need to spend 4,600 on a transmission for a vehicle
 - If article doesn't pass, funds in detail fund can go to the transmission replacement
 - Command Vehicle can be used when on patrol if really needed
- Neal Kurk inquired- Chief wants 5 Patrol Vehicles, we have a Dodge Charger that is in bad shape and needs a transmission, so on a temporary basis he has been using the old Command Vehicle to fill in. The Chief said under the terms of the grant, with exceptions for unusual circumstances the command vehicle could not become a daily patrol vehicle.
- James Drury added- My understanding is that it will remain in position as a command vehicle, but it will be used as a patrol vehicle but won't be a first line patrol vehicle in name, it can be moved into that position as necessary.
- Tom Flaherty commented- Chief would like this compliment of cars to be able to respond to an emergency, if one car trapped at an emergency, he wants an additional car in order to respond to an additional emergency, a contingency situation.
- Tom Clow added- We need to get rid of Dodges, they've been an issue. Short comings of the vehicles are obvious, plus ergonomic issues.
- James Drury commented- To add about 4k to a vehicle to a replace a transmission doesn't make sense to me
- Chargers all have issues

- Karie Tepper added- There are 3 other Chargers that are online, we have a number of charger vehicles that the town is looking to get out of service. Police have 5 patrols, 1 is out of service and 2 command vehicles.
 - Makes sense to have 2 command vehicles
 - Tahoes are 8 cylinders but when they are idling, they switch to 4, so they save aging life.
- Lori Davis added- She is against the vehicle; Town doesn't have many issues that require multiple command vehicles.
- Elizabeth Evans added- I agree, I do not support this article, we have enough cruisers
- Neal Kurk asked-*"Did the Finance Committee recommend a vehicle last year?"*
 - Finance Committee recommended 7-1 last year but it didn't pass
 - Tom Flaherty looked up the election results and said it passed, with funds coming from ARPA and taxation
 - Got a cruiser last year
- Tom Clow added- Chief has done a good job of spelling out the needs and sticking to rotating vehicles so he can get the old ones out. Command Vehicles are for emergencies such as shootings, can't assume we live in a safer community

All those in favor of recommending Article 13, Police Cruiser, Tom Clow, James Drury, Neal Kurk, and Karie Tepper. (5)

All those who are not in favor of recommending Article 13, Police Cruiser, Tom Flaherty, Lori Davis, Elizabeth Evans, Bill Anderson, Jessica Kallipolites, and John Merva (6)

Neal Kurk motioned to not recommend Article 13, Police Cruiser, Lori Davis seconded.

All those in favor of not recommending Article 13, Police Cruiser, Tom Flaherty, Lori Davis, Elizabeth Evans, Bill Anderson, Jessica Kallipolites, and John Merva (6)

All those against not recommending Article 13, Police Cruiser, Tom Clow, James Drury, Neal Kurk, and Karie Tepper. (5)

Article 14, Police Revolving Fund Establishment

James Drury made the motion to recommend Article 14, Police Revolving Fund Establishment, Lori Davis seconded

- Lori Davis stated- I am 100% against this article, other safety equipment doesn't state that it needs to be approved by Town Meeting.
- Neal Kurk shared his concerns- This is another special fund that is being created, creates a separate article where power is taken away from voters and given to the Board of Selectmen.
- Naomi Bolton added- This article will be changed, there will not be another public hearing on the changed version, had to continue Public Hearing into 2 days, Naomi sent warrants over to DRA and Legal, they will come back with responses. Next Wednesday Committee will see final signed warrant

The committee agreed to postpone discussion and vote on this article at the next meeting when language is complete.

Article 15, Cable fund from Franchise Agreement

- Naomi Bolton commented- Town had a public hearing to renew the Comcast Agreement, a part of the renewal was to give 30k on top on monthly franchise fee to be put in the Capital Reserve for upgraded equipment. Not coming from Franchise Agreement, comes from agreement that Town signed for 7 years
- Neal Kurk asked- *"The Franchise Fee, how much is that and where does it go?"*
- Naomi Bolton responded- It goes into the General Funds, and she doesn't know how much it is- depends on subscribers. Monthly check goes into revenues.
- Neal Kurk followed up- *"If this article were defeated, what would happen to the 30k?"*
- Naomi Bolton responded - It will sit in the undesignated fund balance, already committed to be used for something, can take 30k in agreement to offset taxes when agreement said you would get 30k to upgrade the cable equipment.
- Neal Kurk added- If money was given to us for an express purpose, it is different than an inducement to go with Comcast than AT&T
- Naomi Bolton added- There were additional drops that the Town wanted, there were additional things Town wanted in contract. There have been discussions about setting up an additional meeting room upstairs, to have multiple live meetings.
- Neal Kurk asked- *"So we have a legal obligation with Comcast to use this money for specific things?"*
- Naomi Bolton Responded- Not sure it's a legal obligation but idea is that we would get money to upgrade the equipment, Cable Committee goes to Selectmen with requests to use these funds. Cable requests came to town as an unanticipated revenue.

James Drury made the motion to recommend Article 15, Cable fund from Franchise Agreement, Lori Davis seconded

Tom Clow commented- We should continue to have upgrades, we do need an additional meeting space, always need to juggle planning committee/ town meetings

All those in favor of recommending Article 15, Cable fund from Franchise Agreement, Jessica Kallipolites, Bill Anderson, Maria Fossiano, Tom Clow, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, and James Drury (7)

All those in favor of not recommending Article 15, Cable Fund and Franchise Agreement, Lori Davis, Neal Kurk, John Merva, and Elizabeth Evans (4)

- Bill Anderson asked for reasons for not recommending
 - Money could be better used to offset taxes
 - Money could be used to reduce the cost of other expenditures

Article 16, Full Time Building Inspector

James Drury made the motion to recommend Article 16, Full Time Building Inspector, Lori Davis seconded

- James Drury added- This is correcting a mistake made a couple years ago when building inspector retired, they thought they could do with just a part time inspector but then they realized they have enough work for a full-time building inspector
- Neal Kurk added- This was a re-organization, some positions were made full time, others were made part time, Selectmen are trying to expand the number of full-time people, Neal is weary of doing this, new construction is down, and not sure we need a full-time building inspector
- Naomi Bolton offered insight into the article- In 2009, had a fulltime building inspector and land use coordinator, this individual retires, and Town has a hard time deciding what to do, land use was up, building was down, as a result Town reorganized. Town made Land Use full time and moved building inspector to part time. Town doesn't have a building inspector at this time. Nobody wants to work part time. 2021, Land Use and Building Inspector left. Building Inspectors hold up contractors when they are only part time, they only have so much availability.
- John Merva asked- *"Is it possible to contract these services?"*
- Naomi Bolton responded- We can, I believe but that person would come with insurance and would get a binder for what he is doing. If the inspector does an inspection and the house falls down, they will come after the town. This warrant would be an addition to what is already in the budget for this expense.
- Neal Kurk commented- He has an issue with way article is written, it makes it seem the position is only 52 thousand dollars
- Naomi Bolton responded- It says in addition to
- Bill Anderson commented- We would put in mailer that the cost in the article reflects the added cost to change from part time position to full time position with benefits
- Naomi Bolton asked- *"So, you are looking for 3 numbers in every warrant article like that?"*
- Neal Kurk responded- Yes, I want the total cost, not the additional cost.

All those in favor of making the Building Inspector Full Time, Bill Anderson, Maria Fossiano, Tom Clow, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Elizabeth Evans, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Lori Davis, and James Drury.(10)

All those not in favor of making the Building Inspector Full time- Neal Kurk(1)

- Neal not convinced we need a full-time building inspector
- Tom Flaherty would like to make sure we add that this is a cost in addition to what is already being paid for part time inspector.

Article 17, 10-Wheeler

James Drury made the motion to recommend Article 17, 10-Wheeler, Lori Davis seconded

- \$79,797.36 coming from House Bill 2 to offset the cost of this truck
- Neal Kurk asked James why he was in favor of this article

- James responded- To continue the replacement of aging vehicles and reduce maintenance costs. Maintaining workability of department. If a truck goes down another truck has to be taken off its route to move old vehicle and someone has to work on vehicle to get it up and running, meaning there is a delay in clearing roads
- Bill Anderson added- DPW is looking to replace the worst hunk-a-junk they have, could potentially expand routes, and carry more sand with 10-wheelers
- Neal Kurk commented- Is this the year when they need that truck when they don't have the folks on staff to drive it?
- Tom Flaherty commented- We bought a truck last year and there is a 40k difference, didn't get VW grant that would have offset the cost. Need to buy one before the price goes up again next year.

All those in favor of Article 17 10-Wheeler, Bill Anderson, Maria Fossiano, Tom Clow, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Elizabeth Evans, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Neal Kurk, Lori Davis, and James Drury.

Article 18, State of NH Bridge Funds- Per HB2

James Drury made the motion to recommend Article 18, State of NH Bridge Fund, Lori Davis seconded

- Fund for all of the bridges but the one on River Rd is in the worst condition
- This article is to pull money into the Bridge Reconstruction Fund.
- State hasn't matched the fund yet; money has to be available as soon as state has it ready
 - We need 20% of the total cost available for total replacement of River Rd Bridge.
- Neal Kurk asked- Does the fund need this money and is it possible to use this money for another purpose?
 - No, it is bridge fund, can only be used for bridges
- There are 2 other bridges in addition to River Rd

All those in favor of recommending Article 18 State of NH Bridge Funds, Bill Anderson, Maria Fossiano, Tom Clow, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Elizabeth Evans, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Neal Kurk, Lori Davis, and James Drury. (11)

Article 19, Road Reconstruction

James Drury made the motion to recommend Article 19, Road Reconstruction, Lori Davis seconded

- Cost has increased over the years, when Town did the bond to catch up on roads in poor condition, this is for road reconstruction and keeping up with roads that aren't already in need
- Naomi Bolton provided insight- Last year cost was 640k, it was money left over from projects from the year before in the Capital Reserve Fund, so Town opted to reduce amount to 500, always have been around 600k. Last year was the exception.

Those in favor of recommending Article 19, Road Reconstruction, Bill Anderson, Maria Fossiano, Tom Clow, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Elizabeth Evans, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Neal Kurk, and James Drury. (10)

Those in favor of not recommending Article 19, Road Reconstruction, Lori Davis

- Lori's reason for not recommending, Town has roads that aren't covered by this, those people pay taxes, and get no benefit

Article 20, Roadside Mower

James Drury made the motion to recommend Article 20, Roadside Mower, John Merva seconded

- Lori Davis commented- She believes they should rent for another year
- Neal Kurk commented- This is 175k which is a huge expenditure, in the short term we could contract this out

Those in favor of recommending Article 20, Roadside Mower, Tom Clow (1)

Those in favor of not recommending Article 20 Roadside Mower, Bill Anderson, Maria Fossiano, Lori Davis, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Elizabeth Evans, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Neal Kurk, and James Drury. (10)

Lori Davis motioned to not recommend warrant article as written, Jessica Kallipolites seconded

Those opposed to recommending Article 20 Roadside Mower, Bill Anderson, Maria Fossiano, Lori Davis, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Elizabeth Evans, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Neal Kurk, and James Drury. (10)

Those who are opposed to not recommending Article 20 Roadside Mower, Tom Clow (1)

- Tom Clow wanted to recommend because it is most cost effective to have roadside mower

Article 21, Trailer Caddy

James Drury made the motion to recommend Article 21, Trailer Caddy, Lori Davis seconded

- DPW currently needs someone with a CDL (a) which means qualified to drive a trailer truck to move the trailer around on Town Property
- This is a caddy that would not require a license to do it, wouldn't need to call someone in on overtime
- Manufacturer will take it back if Caddy doesn't work
- DPW pays overtime for people to come in on a Saturday to move trailer
- John Merva asked- *"Why is there no Tax Impact?"*
- Tom Flaherty responded- Coming from Transfer Station Revolving Fund

All in favor of recommending Article 21, Trailer Caddy, Bill Anderson, Maria Fossiano, Lori Davis, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Elizabeth Evans, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Neal Kurk, Tom Clow, and James Drury. (11)

Article 22, Landfill Cap

- James Drury made the motion to recommend Article 22, Landfill Cap, Lori Davis seconded
- Something we have to do, there is not a choice on this one, have to do for safety
- Naomi Bolton commented- Landfill has a cap on it, and by state law the Town has to keep it covered with cap. We had a lot of rain that filled up the drainage, cap started to float, and fell off the backside. Now it is uncovered, DES came down for a walk through, need to renew permit. Could have spent year end money on this but opted to put it in front of the voters. If Town doesn't get funds, could be fined.

All in favor of recommending Article 22, Landfill Cap, Bill Anderson, Maria Fossiano, Lori Davis, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Elizabeth Evans, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Neal Kurk, Tom Clow, and James Drury. (11)

Article 23, Cy-Pres Cemetery

James Drury made the motion to recommend Article 23, Cy-Pres Cemetery, Lori Davis seconded

- Tom Flaherty said that this article is usually 10k, but went up to 30k this year due to a lot of work that needs to be done at cemeteries

All in favor of recommending Article 23, Cy-Pres Cemetery, Bill Anderson, Maria Fossiano, Lori Davis, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Elizabeth Evans, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Neal Kurk, Tom Clow, and James Drury. (11)

Article 24, CC Forester

James Drury made the motion to recommend Article 24, CC Forester, Lori Davis seconded

- Lori Davis said that the funds will come from Town Forest account so there will be no tax impact
- Have to maintain the forest
- There is some revenue from maintenance and harvesting

All in favor of recommending Article 24, CC Forester, Bill Anderson, Maria Fossiano, Lori Davis, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Elizabeth Evans, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Neal Kurk, Tom Clow, and James Drury. (11)

Article 25, CC Second Article

James Drury made the motion to recommend Article 25, CC Second Article, Lori Davis seconded

- James Drury commented- He is not for this article, there is a lot of contention going on around this article, spending one more year not dealing with it to get all the legal opinions on it to come to the correct conclusion is worth the time
- Town may get a legal response by Monday unclear

Elizabeth Evans abstains from discussion and voting on this article, she is on the board for the Forest Society, an Executive Trustee

Bill Anderson abstained from voting on this article, he lives in the neighborhood

All in favor of recommending Article 25, CC Second Article- No committee members

All in favor of not recommending Article 25, CC Second Article, Maria Fossiano, Lori Davis, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Neal Kurk, Tom Clow, and James Drury (9)

James Drury made the motion to not recommend Article 25, CC Second Article, Lori Davis seconded

All in favor of not recommending Article 25, CC Second Article, Maria Fossiano, Lori Davis, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Neal Kurk, Tom Clow, and James Drury (9)

Article 27 (Petition) - Direct Conservation Commission to Take Immediate Action on the division of East Road property

James Drury made the motion to not recommend Article 27, Neal Kurk seconded

Elizabeth Evans and Bill Anderson abstain for reasons stated in Article above.

All in favor of not recommending Article 27, Maria Fossiano, Lori Davis, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Neal Kurk, Tom Clow, and James Drury (9)

Article 28 Petition – Rescind Land Use Change Tax Deposits to CC Fund

James Drury made the motion to not recommend Article 28, Lori Davis seconded

- Asking the Town to rescind taking 75% of the land use tax and putting it into this fund
- If you have land in current use, you pay almost no taxes, but law says when you subdivide it then you pay a tax, and in Weare it is 10% of what you sell it for
- 75% of the 10% goes into the conservation fund and conservation commission uses that money to obtain land for conservation
- Current use money goes into current use fund that does not require town meeting, what requires town meeting is the Town Forest money, conservation commission has free will to expend funds, does not go to town meeting

All in favor of not recommending Article 28, Maria Fossiano, Lori Davis, Karie Tepper, Tom Flaherty, Jessica Kallipolites, John Merva, Neal Kurk, Tom Clow, and James Drury (9)

- No Minutes approval this evening

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tom will be taking the minutes next week as the secretary will be unavailable to complete minutes within the legally bounded time
--	--	---