

Public Hearing on acceptance of Conservation Easement on Village Place: Jae has approved the form as has John Wallace and the attorney for the owner. Her comments on process: Per RSA 36-A, the selectmen have to approve accepting the conservation easement. If they already have done that – it just needs to be signed. Hopefully they authorized the chair to sign on behalf of the board rather than all having to sign it. If they have not already approved it – needless to say, RSA 36-A does not provide any guidance as to the type of notice that is required for the selectmen. Per RSA 36-A:5, III, the commission must give notice per RSA 675:7, which requires at least 10 days notice, not including the day the notice is posted or the day of the hearing, and posted in at least 2 public places and published in a newspaper. In other words, the same notice as must be given for adopting a zoning ordinance. I recommend the SM provide the same notice. Conservative approach yes, but given the lack of direction, the safest route. ***Will the Board of Selectmen accept the Conservation Easement?***

Public Hearing on Personnel Plan:

1. I propose the Board accept the changes in the plan language for Health Insurance (85% of HMO) and Retirement (less 457 options for new enrollees). While the savings of everyone moving to the HMO rate is not great (\$12,183) in part as both rates dropped from earlier projections, it starts moving in the direction we will have to go for ACA by 2018. ***What does the Board wish to do?***
2. I propose the Board reject the draft changes to the earned time at this time with a vote. It is creating a lot of controversy with little actual savings to the town. The issue is not time sensitive unlike the decisions on Health Insurance which need to occur. While I recommending leaving this issue alone for now, if the Board feels it must do something, I would suggest the Board could ask the Town Administrator to develop language to propose reducing the current accrual by 3-6 days and creating that number of accruable sick days that cannot be cashed out, leaving the total the same. This would be similar to what was offered to the police union but rejected in favor of reducing the accrual, increasing the % of buyout, and grandfathering those with more than 16 years. ***What does the Board wish to do?***
3. Fire Chief asked: "I would like to ask that you align the Fire & Rescue Full-time employees with the recently negotiated CBA between the police and the town. I feel that this is a reasonable agreement that would work for our department. The town policy has always put Police & Fire/Rescue together separate from other town employees and I believe it is in the best interest of all involved to continue in this manner. I thank you for your consideration on this matter and I am available to discuss this if you would like." (end email) I would suggest the Board ask him what parts of the police contract he is referring to that he would like.

Decision on Health Insurance: The decision needs to be made at this meeting on Health Insurance options in order for notices to be made timely under ACA requirements, but it is quite straight forward. Staying with the current HMO is a better deal than School Care by at least \$45,599 and could be much more depending upon a second expected rebate that should occur this upcoming year as a result of a \$13 million repayment from PLT to Health Trust. Staying with the current HMO copay for doctors and RX is actually cheaper than going to a higher copay by \$19,815. This seems counter intuitive but we were locked in at the schools rate for 2014-15 and the final rate is a reduction over 2013-2014. This will

obviously need to be revisited in 2015. ***Does the Board wish to continue with the current carrier and plans, with the understanding the town's payment will be for the HMO amount if the personnel plan language above was approved?***

Wilheim parcel inside Tamposi boundaries: ***Does the Town want to approve the Conservation Commission purchasing the property?***

Tax Deeded property on Small Road: ***Shall the town put this out for sealed bid?***

Planning Board Appointments: Tony Gaudiello met with me to make clear the Planning Board does not feel comfortable making a recommendation. He also showed me there is a one year slot alternate available. Here is his email: *"The planning board members took up the question of providing recommendations to the BOS on candidates (1 new & 1 renewal). It was clear that the majority of the board were "uncomfortable" with proceeding with such evaluative discussions (1) in a public forum, (2) on or with persons with whom they may eventually serve as colleagues (3) even acknowledging that what is being requested is a "recommendation", the comments indicated that responsibility for appointment rested with the BOS. My impression of the whole is that evaluative sessions which are to be conducted in open forums, especially those that would result in a negative recommendation is the nub. Further, the notion that the members of the planning board bring a more "experienced" based knowledge to the issues did not weigh to offset that core concern. My own view is sympathetic with the notion that this is a "quasi personnel matter" and the public nature of the meetings is not in keeping with generally accepted processes for personnel selection or review even if limited to forming recommendations in the such processes. John, while we did not talk on this directly, there is a topic that might bear some review and discussion. That is, in the general instance, ought we use the "alternate slots" for appointments as a sort of "training and assessing time." A qualification on this; the word "generally" intends to convey that there are certainly persons for whom such a period would be unnecessary as their "knowledge of land use law, regulation, and process" have already been demonstrated. I don't think such a process would be inconsistent with law and practice. In its way, it would be moving such a practice from an "as needed and advisable" status to being the general rule."* (end of Tony's email) The Board could appoint Mr. Williams for a 3 year full slot and Mr. Ayers to a 1 year alternate slot. ***What does the Board wish to do?***

Use of Capital Reserve: We discussed last year about using and closing some of the Trust Funds with small amounts for a qualifying purpose rather than plan to build it back up for a purpose. In 2001 Art #25 Town Meeting passed a Road Reclamation Capital reserve with the Board of Selectmen agent to expend. It has \$3,952.34 in it. We now maintain two other road funds, one a capital reserve. It is easier to use or close than change the purpose (60% Town Meeting vote). ***Will the Board vote to request the entirety of the fund, closing it out, for use in road reclamation this year?***

Use of Capital Reserve: In 2011 the town established a Transportation fund under the provision of RSA 261:153, created by a surcharge on vehicle registrations of \$5 and named the Board of Selectmen the agent to expend. (the collection of a fee of \$5 per vehicle registration, with 100% going for a municipal road capital improvement fund and to name the Board of Selectmen the agent to expend for such

transportation improvements as allowed under RSA 261:153.) We currently have \$95,986.55 in the fund (and have about \$20,000 that hasn't been transferred over yet since we only make the transfer at year end). I attach at the end of this report a copy of the relevant statute. The statute allows for engineering and construction among other things. I am asking the Board to authorize the use of the fund for two purposes. First as a match to the \$250,000 +/- Young Road Culvert in which FEMA will pay about \$200,000 if we receive the grant. For the grant application we have to identify the source of the match and I recommend this source. Secondly since we have asked to have two bridges in line to come out of the NH Bridge aid money, I would like to use some of this money for engineering. New Hampshire DOT will eventually reimburse 80%, but we need to demonstrate we have money available now. We will need to pay about \$64,000 up front on Green Hill engineering while we await the state's reimbursement. While we don't have that much total in this fund right now, we are adding about \$5,000 a month and it will be some time before the funds are needed. **Will the Board authorize the use of the Transportation fund to pay for these two purposes out of the Capital Reserve held by the Trustees for the transportation improvements?**

Green Hill Road Engineering: One of the outcomes of the engineering will be alternatives. NHDOT will decide which of the alternatives it is willing to fund and then the Town would be on its own to proceed with more work. One of the alternatives needs to be renovation of the existing bridge, although I believe we will find a number of abutment and other issues that will require adoption of a different and more complete alternative. ***Does the Board of Selectmen authorize the Town Administrator to sign the engineering contract authorized by NHDOT with HTA to proceed?***

Solar Power: There were two respondents to the Request for Qualifications. The Board has reviewed the qualifications of both firms.

1. The Board could choose one of them to consult on solar and/or to develop plans to make a more specific proposal.
2. The Board could ask the two who submitted qualifications to draw up plans specifically for locating solar on the new highway garage and submit to this limited Request for Proposal.
3. The Board could reject both, develop broad specs for locating solar on the new highway garage and put out a new Request for Bid or a Request for Proposal to which anyone could reply.

I do not recommend #2. It seems if we are making this much a change in the process we need to start over and open it to competition from a broader field. I question if we have the internal expertise to evaluate bids or proposals if we go #3, especially as to judging quality of construction and how good a financial deal it is for the town. **What would the Board like to do?**

Property and Liability Insurance: We put out an RFP for Property and Liability Insurance. I want to again state I am a Trustee for Primex, but I make no money on that position and have no financial or other benefit from PRIMEX impacted by the Board's decision one way or the other. My first fiduciary duty is to the Town in this matter. There were five companies interested (Travelers, Gratzfelter, Trident national underwriters each represented locally), Health Trust (PLT was absorbed by them this year as a result of the Secretary of State's action), and Primex. Gratzfelter (via Davis and Towle) withdrew after

gathering information as it realized its rates were not competitive from other bids around the state. Immanuel Insurance in Barrington represented both Travelers and Trident. Travelers spent a lot of time gathering information but concern with the Swain Lake Dam caused them to not to submit a quote. Trident's quote rejected coverage for bridges and the Swain Lake Dam as of the time of the quote. The only two fully compliant were our current carrier, the Health Trust, and Primex. Here are the quoted amounts: PRIMEX \$55,912 with a promised savings of \$1,553 if we complete their PRIME program (we are nearly compliant as of right now). Immanuel Insurance (Trident) \$58,695. Health Trust \$58,771. I did not do further research on Trident. I have extensive experience with both PRIMEX and the Health Trust (PLT) and believe they are equivalent in current services. I recommend PRIMEX. ***Does the Board accept my recommendation?***

Multi-year: I recommend we lock in our rate with a maximum increase of 7% in each of the next two years. ***Does the Board wish to lock in the rate for 3 years?***

Svenson purchase and sales: We now have the preliminary plan with wetlands and topography mapped for the property. This is still a draft. We continue to gather data and I am seeking to find out how much for an engineer to see preliminarily if we can fit a 9,000 square foot print library/community center building (14,000 total) and a 6,000 square foot town office building (11,000) total with 100 parking spaces (square footage requirement in zoning), well and septic. I have not proceeded with the purchase and sales because of the request from Svenson that we put a warrant article on the ballot in 2015 for erecting a building on the location and it is returned if a building is not erected by 2016. ***Does the Board wish to do differently than that plan?***

Information:

Upcoming Meetings: ***April 15 with the Library Trustees at 6 PM and May 12 with the Recreation Commission.***

FEMA Maps: We have received new FEMA maps for the county that do not change Barrington.

Tax Deeded Beauty Hill Road: **Regarding the property with lakefront** the son of the late former owner (who has had health problems since we talked that he indicates were the reason he hasn't talked to me since December) is in contact again and has agreed he wants to clean up the property and repurchase it. He is disposing of a house in Nashua that is part of the estate that would raise funds to enable him to repurchase. I am going to wait to proceed until we see if his promised follow-through works. **Regarding the one for subdivision:** We have not heard back yet on the request for financial information on the waiver from the owner who was given until April 16. The one who wants to subdivide finds the 15% charge could be a deal breaker on going ahead because it raises the cost of the lot above what he could buy one for. (Total (not including subdivision or substantial driveway costs) as of July 30 would be approximately \$63,000 with a 15% penalty, \$45,000 with a 7.5% penalty and \$28,000 with no penalty)

Motor Vehicle \$5 fee: 261:153 VI. (a) Beginning on July 1, 1997, in addition to the motor vehicle registration fees collected under paragraphs I and V, the legislative body of a municipality may vote to collect an additional fee for the purpose of supporting a municipal and transportation improvement

fund, which shall be a capital reserve fund established for this purpose and governed by the provisions of RSA 34 and RSA 35 for cities and towns, respectively. Of the amount collected, up to 10 percent, but not more than \$0.50 of each fee paid, may be retained by the local official designated by the municipal government or by the town or city clerk for administrative costs. The remaining amount shall be deposited into the municipal transportation improvement fund established to allow a community to fund, wholly or in part, improvements in the local or regional transportation system including roads, bridges, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, parking and intermodal facilities and public transportation. The funds may be used for engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction costs of transportation facilities, and for operating and capital costs of public transportation only. The funds may be used as matching funds for state or federal funds allocated for local or regional transportation improvements. Such funds shall not be used to offset any other non-transportation appropriations made by the municipality.

...

(3) A town or city may choose to restrict the use of the municipal transportation improvement fund to one or more of the transportation system modes provided for in paragraph VI(a). Any such restriction shall be so stated in the wording of the question.

Below and on the next page is the Health Insurance information:

	Current PPO- HMO mix	85% of HMO	
Total Yearly Premium (both employee & employer	\$546,318.72	\$585,121.80	
Yrly Town Cost (85%)	\$485,170.91	\$497,353.53	
		\$12,182.62	Cost savings to 85% of HMO

Monthly Numbers	HealthTrust current HMO, 2014-2015 rates	HealthTrust proposed HMO	School Care	Opt Out
Town cost month	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 650.00
Town cost month	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 433.33
Town cost month	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 650.00
Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	

Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 1,507.50	\$ 1,571.83	\$ 1,574.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 1,507.50	\$ 1,571.83	\$ 1,574.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 1,507.50	\$ 1,571.83	\$ 1,574.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 1,507.50	\$ 1,571.83	\$ 1,574.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 1,507.50	\$ 1,571.83	\$ 1,574.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 1,507.50	\$ 1,571.83	\$ 1,574.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 1,507.50	\$ 1,571.83	\$ 1,574.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 2,035.13	\$ 2,121.97	\$ 2,125.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 2,035.13	\$ 2,121.97	\$ 2,125.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 2,035.13	\$ 2,121.97	\$ 2,125.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 2,035.13	\$ 2,121.97	\$ 2,125.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 2,035.13	\$ 2,121.97	\$ 2,125.00	
Total cost monthly	\$	\$	\$	

	2,035.13	2,121.97	2,125.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 2,035.13	\$ 2,121.97	\$ 2,125.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 2,035.13	\$ 2,121.97	\$ 2,125.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 2,035.13	\$ 2,121.97	\$ 2,125.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 2,035.13	\$ 2,121.97	\$ 2,125.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 2,035.13	\$ 2,121.97	\$ 2,125.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 2,035.13	\$ 2,121.97	\$ 2,125.00	
Total cost monthly	\$ 753.75	\$ 785.91	\$ 787.00	
Total Yearly Premium (both employee & employer	\$ 546,319	\$ 569,630	\$ 570,432	
Yrly Town Cost (85%)	\$ 466,104	\$ 485,919	\$ 486,601	
Based on these assumptions for the HMO options:				
1. Health Trust plan in first column has \$5 copay, prescription drug is \$3/\$15/\$1 (current)				
2. Health Trust plan in second column has \$10 copay, prescription drug is \$10/\$20/\$45				
3. School Care Co-Pay is \$10.00 and Prescription Drug prices are \$5/\$15/\$35				
4. Town pays 85%				
5. Benefits change happens at 7/1/14				
Note 6 School care more than current or proposed by...	\$ 20,496	With loss of rebate a total of \$45,599 more and this will almost certainly go up because of another rebate we are likely to get		
Note 7 Changing Health Trust plans more expensive than staying with current plan by	\$ 19,815	Best to stay with current HMO because of grandfathered rates and Rx plan		
Note 8 Employer rebate stay Health Trust	\$ 29,533	85% is \$25,103		