

**Approved Minutes of the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC)
Temple Municipal Offices
Wed. January 26, 2005**

Members present

Steve Andersen
Rae Barnhisel
Brian Kullgren
Allan Oxman

Others present

James McTague (Police Chief)
Charlene Eddy (Select Board)

Meeting called to order at 7:30 pm

1. Minutes from January 12, 2005 (Mtg. 14) approved as written.
2. J. McTague presented estimates prepared by Tedd Petro (Select Board) regarding the budgetary impact of the proposed police department cooperative agreement between the Temple and Greenville Select Board (copy attached). He offered specific information regarding the merger (draft information attached; sent to McTague for review 2/3/05; awaiting comments from McTague with comment deadline of 2/9/05).
3. Members received a 1-26-05 Budget Worksheet and noted the following changes/no changes in line items:
 - a. Town Meeting Postage (p.1) at a proposed \$300 with Comments to “Mail Temple Newsletter to Voters.” It was agreed that past newsletters as well as the newsletter that was mailed last year showed a level of bias toward special interest groups that made mailing it an imprudent use of public funds.
 - b. Abatements and Refunds (p.3) increased from \$50,000 to \$60,000. Members agreed there was no justification in such an increase given the recent realization of how best to tax non-profit residential facilities per last year’s meeting with the town attorney, BAC chair, and two Select Board members.
 - c. Planning Board and Zoning Board of Adjustment Legal line items (p. 5) decreased from \$1 to 0.
 - d. General Government Heating Oil line items for the Municipal Offices and the Town Hall (p. 6) increased from \$2500 to \$2800 and \$1000 to \$1500, respectively. The BAC noted that expenditures were \$1624 over and \$820 under, respectively. There was no explanation for why the increase in Town Hall heating oil when the previous amount budgeted appeared adequate.
 - e. Other Public Safety category (p. 9) not broken down by department. Rather, the Comments section for the Town Gasoline, and Town Diesel Fuel itemizes expenses for the highway, fire, and police depts.
 - f. Communications (p.9) has been increased from \$14,000 to \$17,000. The comments section itemizes expenses but needs adjusting to reflect the change in amount.
 - g. Highway Department Labor (p. 9) not broken down by employee. Rather, the Comments section itemizes the road agent salary and 2 equipment operators including the Overtime expenditure.
 - h. Wilton Recycling Center (p. 10) decreased from \$53,500 to \$47,000.
 - i. Animal Control line items (p. 10) have been zeroed for 2 years: Court Time, Group Health, Miscellaneous Expenses, Training, Equipment, and Animal Shelter and can be deleted.

- j. Health Officer Expenses (p. 10) at \$6500 with Comments for “Conservation Area & Dump Monitoring & Dues.” Barnhisel pointed out that the line item is becoming a catch-all for a number of vague and unjustifiable expenditures. Any area or dump monitoring is work on public property. She asked whether funds for public property should be appropriated in the expense line item of a non-contracted employee/consultant. Other town employees such as Building Inspector and Animal Control Officer have designated line items for such things as Dues & Subscriptions and Training & Seminar. “Expenses” are broken down by line item rather than simply used in a title. Whereas Health Officer Expenses is a Category and a Line Item. Oxman asked why the whole amount was not taken out of the budget given that it was a one-time and/or unusual expense and be presented as a warrant article at town meeting. Members agreed that a warrant article was the right way to approach the issue.
 - k. Project Lift and Community Kitchen line items have been zeroed for 2 years and can be deleted.
 - l. Library (p. 11) with its number of last minute changes and seemingly random increases and decreases should be addressed in the following way next year. Library Trustees and the Librarian will meet with the BAC as all other departments do in the fall and help coordinate increases and decreases and agree on needs and strategies. Library Miscellaneous line item has not been deleted.
 - m. Conservation Commission (p. 12) with its number of last minute changes should be addressed in the following way next year. ConCom members will meet with the BAC as all other boards do (or should do) in the fall and help coordinate increases and decreases and agree on needs and strategies. The BAC agreed that the increase in Professional Services line item is excessive and wondered whether it was even appropriate to have an appointed committee engage in contracts on behalf of the town. Barnhisel asked why the whole amount was not taken out of the budget given that it was a one-time and/or unusual expense and be presented as a warrant article at town meeting.
 - n. General Fund bottom line has increased further from \$1,130,110 to \$1,137,708.
4. Members agreed that Barnhisel should draft a letter (copy with Andersen’s editing changes attached) itemizing the BAC’s various concerns that Andersen would pass on to Select Board members prior to the Budget Hearing on Sat. Feb. 5, 2005 at 10:00 am at the Town Hall (*Note: properly noticed in the Monadnock Ledger 1/27/05, 10 days prior*).
5. C. Eddy told the BAC that S. Fiske (Select Board and contractor) was sending the Town Report to press February 7, 2005 (the day prior to the next Select Board meeting) and would not be able to provide proofs to the BAC because she herself had not received them. She stated she was putting together a procedures manual to make the development process of the budget and warrant articles occur in a more orderly, transparent fashion. BAC members support this idea.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Rae Barnhisel
February 9, 2005

PD MERGER INFORMATION (as of 2/9/05):

McTague cited the following advantages of the merger. It would solve the limited space problem because Greenville's space is adequate. An officer would be assigned to Temple's office 7 days a week from 7 am to 3 pm, coverage currently not in place. There would be 3 cruisers (2 from Temple; Greenville is purchasing a new cruiser (Nissan Pathfinder) on 4/1/05 regardless of whether the merger goes through.). Temple would hire a full-time officer (currently Temple has 6 positions, 2 full-time, one is McTague, the other is vacant). Greenville plans to hire 2 full-time officers (and would keep them if the merger did not go through (currently Greenville has 4 part-time officers. They did have 5 positions of 3 part-time officers and 2 full-time officers, one of which is a police chief).

McTague is currently working as a consultant for the Town of Greenville. He explained he was asked to swear in but refused. His intent is simply to organize its police department so that if the merger goes through, he is able to more easily integrate the two towns. McTague's salary would increase from \$48,000 to \$58,000 if the merger went through. Barnhisel asked McTague if Greenville had offered him their vacant police chief position and if not, would they do so in the case of a failed merger? McTague said no, and that he did not know. Barnhisel suggested that an increase in salary could be proposed on the floor at town meeting if the warrant article failed.

McTague explained that all officers must be hired by both towns in order for an officer to have jurisdiction in both towns. The "get out" clause would specify a split of assets and personnel according to which town originally had the asset or employee. Any new officers hired would be told this as a condition of hire. McTague said the terms of the agreement between Temple and Greenville would be superior to the terms of agreement between the Town of Sharon and Peterborough's PD, in that Temple would have greater say over problems in coverage.

April 1, 2005 is the proposed merger date. Although the Select Boards can vote to engage in the contract without voter approval (only NH Attorney General approval per **RSA _____**), the proposed cooperative agreement is going to be presented as a warrant article to be voted upon at both the Temple and Greenville town meeting on March 12, 2005. C. Eddy read the proposed warrant that had been prepared. Members suggested that the pertinent RSA be stated in the warrant article.

The BAC reviewed C. Eddy's copy of the contract that had been approved by both town attorneys and is currently awaiting approval by the state attorney general. It is a 3-year contract with a "get out" clause to dissolve the cooperative at any time with a proposed 6-month notice. The merger would be reviewed every month by an oversight board composed of two members from each Select Board. It was agreed by all those present that T. Petro should and would refrain from being a member of the Cooperative Board given he was McTague's father-in-law. Barnhisel suggested that the contract be made available on overhead transparencies at the 2/17/05 hearing to educate the taxpayer without distributing paper copies of a contract that is undergoing change.

The budget for the Coop Police Dept. is based on population. Greenville has 62% of the combined populations, Temple has 38%. Greenville also has **1/5th** the land area. It was agreed that no changes to the Temple's working budget were necessary in anticipation of an approved merger and that the BAC would revisit the issue next Nov. If approved, the cooperative's budget would not appear in detail in the Budget Worksheet. It would be similar to the cooperative ambulance service and the recycling center single line item. Barnhisel objected that those budgets were not readily available for scrutiny. Barnhisel pointed out that if SB-2 were passed at town meeting, the coop agreement would be an honored contract in the default budget. Members agreed that the monetary savings to the town would be from \$30,000 to \$42,000 in the first year according to the proposed agreement.