

**PUBLIC MEETING AND BUDGET WORKSHOP
FINAL**

PRESENT: T. C. Tocci, Chairman; S. C. Hanson, M. J. Farinola, Selectmen; E. N. Small, Town Administrator; L. A. Ruest, Administrative Assistant

BROWN ROAD CULVERT REPAIRS – WAYNE BARKER: Wayne Barker and Richard Robinson were present. In response to T. C. Tocci, W. Barker reported that he is unaware of the status of repairs to the Brown Road culvert as it has been two and one-half years since the storm event. T. C. Tocci reported that E. N. Small put together documentation outlining the history of actions taken to address this matter to include inspections, specifications drafted, application to FEMA and funds received for damages for review of the Board. It was noted that the cost estimate to repair in accordance with specifications exceeded the amount of funds available. Discussion took place with regard to the repairs specified by the Town Engineer as compared to the proposed repairs determined by W. Barker and R. Robinson. Proposed repairs are to use a larger rip rap stone and environmental cloth and then set blocks back in place. R. Robinson referred the Board to a listing used early in the project for specifications and stated he would be willing to do the work listed. R. Robinson suggested contacting B. Jones of Jones and Beach Engineers to meet with him before starting repairs. Further discussion took place with regard to the need for wetland permits for repair to the culvert, an easement to the Barker property for repair to the block retaining wall and inspection services. S. C. Hanson stated he would like to see the work done and then be done with the project. He added that should a catastrophic event happen in the future, that the same process for FEMA funds might be available. W. Barker stated that the change to the culvert created this situation. E. N. Small suggested that a structural engineer be asked to review the situation on behalf of the Town. The Board requested E. N. Small work with counsel to ensure this proposal is legal; Selectmen are to agree on the easement wording. W. Barker will provide documentation to assist with drafting an easement.

BUDGET WORKSHOP - POLICE DEPARTMENT PAGE 25: R. Dirsa reviewed his proposed budget line-by-line noting increases and decreases and explaining the reasons for changes. He noted that the Salaries lines do not include an increase for Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA) but do include step changes. He reported that the part-time positions line reflects a decrease based on a reduction of a half-day of part-time coverage per week and no COLA. The part-time positions line does include step increases.

R. Dirsa explained the increase in the telephone budget line with regard to modems for the communication system with Rockingham. He also noted an increase in the Other Professional Services line for computer maintenance. He reported that the provider used by the Town at this time has had less time to devote to police department computer needs and acknowledged appreciation for the number of years of service to the Town at little or no cost. He stated that he has found the average cost for this type of service is \$100 per hour. Discussion of using pagers and cell phones versus just one communication device took place. R. Dirsa reviewed the status of devices in place and identified that technology has not yet progressed far enough to address the needs of the Department.

Decreases were reflected in the lines of salaries, photography, advertising, printing, dues and subscriptions, car washes, office supplies, postage, books and periodicals, software, machinery and equipment, other charges, investigative services, uniforms and clothing, meetings and

**PUBLIC MEETING AND BUDGET WORKSHOP
FINAL**

conferences, training, auto reimbursement and food and meals. Increases were reflected in the lines of telephone, other professional services, maintenance and repairs, and gasoline.

R. Dirsa noted that he plans to again request a police cruiser and in-cruiser video camera through warrant article. He added that delaying the purchase of a new vehicle creates a domino effect on the other cruisers aging out. Discussion took place with regard to the new cruisers being used by the State Police as well as a lease/purchase arrangement. M. J. Farinola stated a multi-year lease cost, broken down in the budget, should be considered rather than asking for the full cost by warrant article. The Board asked R. Dirsa to research a lease/purchase for consideration of inclusion in the budget.

M. J. Farinola figured that \$18,565 would represent 5% reduction in this budget and asked R. Dirsa if he could meet this goal. R. Dirsa stated he has trimmed the budget with four budget lines increased and others reduced. He stated he has kept the Police Department budget in line over the years returning approximately \$63,000 to the Town since 2000. He added that most items remained consistent over the years. R. Dirsa explained that if you remove salaries from the budget, \$65,000+/- remains to operate the Department; taking \$18,000 away would affect the operation and services provided by the Police Department. Noting that the budget is a bottom line budget, M. J. Farinola asked R. Dirsa to take another look to see if he can reduce the Police Department budget more.

S. C. Hanson stated he is okay with the budget as presented and suggested that efforts be made to look into reducing the costs for access to information as well as obtaining a new cruiser so that repairs and maintenance costs could be reduced.

S. C. Hanson reviewed his thoughts on removing police detail from the Other Public Safety budget by placing funds in a Capital Reserve Fund for this purpose as well as the purpose of purchasing police vehicles and equipment in the future. He noted that he has questions as to how this would work with respect to funding the account, budgeting, bookkeeping, etc. A review of the way police detail is handled now took place. R. Dirsa stated that the warrant article with regard to Traffic Control (Article 22/08) did not pass last year and resulted in situations where detail was not used creating hazardous situations. T. C. Tocci inquired as to whether the current rates charged are in line with area towns. R. Dirsa stated he plans to conduct a study and present a request to change the rates after the first of the year. E. N. Small was asked to contact towns who handle police detail in the manner S. C. Hanson is suggesting and R. Dirsa was asked to obtain current police detail rate information. R. Dirsa recommended the Traffic Control ordinance be brought forward to warrant article.

HEALTH SERVICES AGENCIES PAGE 42: The Board reviewed the listing of health services agencies. E. N. Small provided documentation outlining support for requests of funds to Board members. M. J. Farinola proposed removing these funds from the budget and providing a warrant article for voters to consider. E. N. Small will draft a warrant article at a level funded amount (\$23,700).

PUBLIC MEETING AND BUDGET WORKSHOP
FINAL

REVIEW UPDATED AMBULANCE SERVICE RFP: Board members reviewed a draft RFP (No. 2008:4-A) provided by E. N. Small. S. C. Hanson reported that he emailed additional ambulance RFP samples to Board members. M. J. Farinola stated he did not receive the emails. S. C. Hanson reported that he spoke with Fire Chiefs of surrounding towns with regard to ambulance service and found that other departments send out an ambulance every time a call comes in. M. J. Farinola reported on a conversation with the Hampton Deputy Fire Chief who indicated Hampton deploys a second vehicle 75% of the time.

Review of the draft took place at this time. The following was noted:

Page 3, Item 12, was revised to read "...for a *one-year* term, subject..."

Page 4, Section 1.1, was revised to remove all boxed items except the first item. Section 1.2 is to be reviewed to verify the number of miles.

Page 5, Item b. is to be revised to show the number of calls of AMR and the Fire Department for the years 2006 and 2007.

Page 6, Section 2.2.1, is to be reviewed by the Fire Chief with suggestions to be made for review of the Board. Section 2.2.3 meeting dates were revised.

Page 7, Section 2.2.4 was revised to remove items b, c, and d; renumbering item e to b.

Page 9, Section 2.2.12 was revised to change the word "County's" to read "Town's." The fifth line of this paragraph was revised to read "Unless all proposals are rejected or the solicitation is cancelled, the Contract is to be awarded to the Respondent whose proposal best meets the ~~requirements and criteria set forth in this solicitation~~ *needs of the town.*"

Page 10, Section 2.2.13 was revised to delete the first sentence in its entirety. Section 2.2.15 was revised to read "Contract *Award*" and the paragraph was deleted and replaced with the sentence "*Hampton Falls Selectmen will award the contract.*"

Page 11, Section 3.1.1, item m was revised to read "area hospitals" rather than "medical director."

Page 12, item q was revised to delete the words "*as referenced in Section 2.2.26 alternative Solutions.*" Item t was revised to read "...numbers of staff dedication to Hampton Falls *to include Mass casualty or disaster events.*" Sub items 1 and 3 are to be deleted. Item v was revised to read "Contractor will provide staffing for *one BLS ambulance and may provide one ALS ambulance for all dispatched calls for service.*" The remainder of the paragraph was deleted.

Page 13, Section 3.1.2, first sentence was deleted and the next sentence was revised to read "...The contractor shall forward a monthly ~~exceptions~~ report *of all response times requirements* to the Hampton Falls Town Administrator."

**PUBLIC MEETING AND BUDGET WORKSHOP
*FINAL***

Page 14, items d and f were deleted.

Page 15, sub-item a) was revised to read “Hampton Falls” rather than “Colorado.”

Page 16, Section 3.1.4 Performance Bond was deleted in its entirety (two paragraphs).

NEXT MEETING – BUDGET WORKSHOP – NOVEMBER 17, 6:30 PM

Meeting adjourned 9:46 p.m.

102708budgetworkshop