

## Town of Litchfield

Selectmen's Meeting

January 23, 2012

Members present: Steve Perry, Chairman  
John R. Brunelle, Vice Chairman  
Frank A. Byron  
George A. Lambert  
Brent T. Lemire

Also present: Jason Hoch, Town Administrator

5:00 p.m. Review of Paperwork and communications

7:00 Call to order

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All rose for the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **Review of items for consent**

1. Minutes of January 1, 2012
2. Request for Girl Scouts to sell cookies at Transfer Station weekends in February and March
3. Memo of Understanding – Manchester Fire Department Regional Emergency Management Command Vehicle

### **Approval of Consent Items:**

Selectman F. Byron motioned to approve the items for consent. Selectman B. Lemire seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0-0.

### **Request for Items – Other Business**

Selectman F. Byron would like to discuss the status of GIS data from State of New Hampshire to Town  
Selectman G. Lambert would like to discuss the rationale behind the position for the Recreation Department put on the warrant articles.

### **Economic Development Discussion**

Selectman F. Byron provided an update to the Board as well as the public in regards to the article that appeared in local papers concerning a State Prison being located in the Town of Litchfield. Selectman Byron stated that back in early January, there was an article that appeared in the Union Leader that indicated the State of New Hampshire was looking to contract private companies and corporations to locate a prison within the southern/central tier of the State of New Hampshire. There was a limited amount of information in the article and Selectman Byron, to determine if the project would be suitable for Litchfield, sent an e-mail to the principals offering to meet in Litchfield. Responding to the email

Mr. Dumais, a large commercial developer in the City of Manchester, responded and agreed to meet on January 17th. Both Mr. Hoch and Selectman Byron met with Mr. Dumais to review what the project and to get some information. Selectman Byron made clear that Mr. Hoch did not send the e-mail to the Mr. Dumais; the email was sent by Mr. Byron as part of the program that the Board had charted him with in order to try and determine if there were commercial development opportunities in the Town of Litchfield. After meeting with Mr. Dumais on the 17th, both Mr. Hoch and Mr. Byron reviewed the project and talked through what it would mean to Litchfield, coming to a decision that it was not in Litchfield's best interest to site a large prison complex in the town. In a telephone call with Mr. Dumais, Mr. Byron told him that Litchfield would not be interested in further discussions on the project and followed up by sending him an e-mail stating that we were not interested in further discussions on the prison project. The reasons for the meeting were multiple, one was to gain information in terms of what type of facility they were talking about, Mr. Byron has been personally involved in facilities that change over time and what they discuss in the paper is not necessarily in keeping with what actually is their plan. Mr. Byron also wanted to understand and gain all of the information necessary to make a recommendation before there was any action taken on the part of the Town one way or the other. Based upon the information collected and the discussion held, there was no intention to put a prison into the Town of Litchfield, there was no decision made to continue any discussions and there is no desire expressed on the part of the Town to site a prison here. Mr. Hoch also commented that he wanted to point out is that the difficulty in something like this is that there was an initial conversation which is the right thing to follow up on and that the town has all sorts of similar conversations frequently. It is a little unusual that before you have that first conversation that preliminary information ends up on the front page of the Union Leader; understandably generating a little anxiety. Mr. Hoch apologized for any undo anxiety that may have been out in the community. On the other hand, there is a somewhat constructive outcome that comes from this and the kinds of conversations that we have been able to have to say "Litchfield is interested in looking at reasonable ways to grow its tax base, we are interested in commercial and industrial development that is a good fit for this community".

There is something out there that is a good match for this community. Mr. Byron stated that he can tell members of the Board as well as the public that there are companies that have approached Litchfield frequently; they come through various channels through the Town such as the code enforcement officer, the Administrator and at times through Selectman Byron. There are opportunities out there that we try to get information on before we can make any decision as to which way we want to go and try and make the right decision for the Town. Selectman Perry added that just for the Board to be aware; Mr. Byron and Mr. Hoch both kept him well in the loop as to what they were doing and the process that was ongoing. We all saw the benefits, but the prison project wasn't the right for the town. Selectman G. Lambert congratulated Selectman Byron and Mr. Hoch for actually engaging in this conversation because it is the right thing to do for our constituents and they are taking a lot of flak on this particular one. It is important to understand that if someone was a real-estate developer and there is land for sale and there is a plan that is consistent with all our rules and regulations, there is not a thing that this Board can do to stop it. Keeping that in mind it is the Board's job to make sure that they are engaged in anyone who wants to come to Litchfield and understanding what's going on to direct our attention to that. Mr. Lambert stated that Selectman Perry brought up a concern a couple of weeks ago that said if we change the impact fee rules and put a large condo development in this town at the same time we suspended impact fees for an elementary school, we could end up because those rules had been changed

with a 500 unit condo fee that actually triples the size of our elementary school and no expense to the people who are putting it in. We need to make sure we are vigilant and diligent in making sure that not only does our planning deal with what our people currently expect in Litchfield but the possibilities because we just had a road put in that will change the commute between Manchester and Boston and everywhere in between, so this community is changing today and so we need to look at everything so that we can have a good prospective.

### **Public Input:**

A resident of Litchfield stated that Mr. Byron answered all his questions. Litchfield Resident Ann Moody asked where the condo units would be located. Selectman Perry stated that there is no plan for Condo developments. This was just an example about getting rid of impact fees at one time that he used to maybe change some peoples mind to let them open up and see the other side. With no other members of the public coming forward Selectman Perry closed the public input.

Selectman F. Byron wanted to mention that Mr. Hoch and he are scheduled to go to Londonderry on Thursday and make a presentation to the Chamber of Commerce, talking about Litchfield. We will be presenting with the Towns of Derry, Londonderry and Hudson; it is a ten minute discussion to try to talk a little bit about Litchfield and our interest in terms of business.

Mr. Byron also stated that his name is in the phone book and if people want information they can call him or e-mail him with any questions. People need to understand that the Board is not going to do something that is wrong in terms of trying to find businesses for the Town of Litchfield; they are going to try to find something that works and makes sense. The reason we are doing this is to reduce people's taxes and cut the amount of money we are all paying. We have land set aside through the Planning Board process in both the northern and southern part of Town that is designed for commercial development that is setting fallow.

### **Grassy Pond Legislation**

Selectman F. Byron stated that back in the early to mid-nineties, the town owned property in back of LMS which was being designated as the location of Campbell High School; Mr. Byron served on the Conservation Commission at that time and the Commission was concerned that grassy pond is an exceptionally rare wetland environment that is actually the only known existence of that type in the State of New Hampshire. The Commission was concerned about losing the wetland. A developer at the time had also bought an adjoining parcel and there was approximately 96 to 97 acres of land involved in the development. The Town needed to build a High School as we were being kicked out of the Hudson School District. One of the things the Commission became involved in was to determine if we could save that property. The Commission ended up off setting wetlands property in Merrimack which had a factory at the time that polluted the ground water. We proposed to the EPA to mitigate the Merrimack wetlands loss by purchasing Grassy Pond in Litchfield. This was done; the School Board and developer sold their portions of the parcel, and that money was used to buy the parcel currently used by Campbell High School. The money used to purchase Grassy Pond was DES money, from the State of New Hampshire and Grassy Pond is currently held by the State of New Hampshire and managed by three groups; DES (which is the Department of Environmental Services for the State of New Hampshire) who is the managing authority, The Nature Conservancy as well as the Litchfield Conservation Commission.

Selectman Byron found RSA 227 h: 5 which under state law lists property owned by the State of New Hampshire that will be retained in perpetuity and not sold by the State. As a private citizen, Mr. Byron petitioned to have Representative Ober put in legislation that would add Grassy Pond to RSA 227 h: 5. This does not change the ownership or management of the parcel; all it says is that before the State can sell it they will have to change the RSA and give us time for Litchfield if we want to try and preserve it to be able to take some type of action internally to the Town to make sure we don't lose that wetland. Representative Ober submitted that legislation and we had five of our Litchfield representatives sponsor that. The primary sponsor was Representative Lynne Ober, with co-sponsors of Laura Gandia, George Lambert, Mr. Robert Haefner (of Hudson) and Andrew Ronzullo (of Hudson). Last week, there was a hearing in front of the Legislative Committee of Resources and Environment. Mr. Byron had approached the Conservation Commission about the RSA change and the Commission voted to support the legislation. Mr. Byron and Joan McKibben testified in front of the committee in favor of saving Grassy Pond through addition to the RSA and the legislative committee had questions. One of the questions was "Did the Selectmen approve of this change?". Mr. Byron stated no, that the Selectmen really are not part of the management of this parcel of land; it is with the Conservation Commission and for this reason it hasn't been brought to a full vote to the Selectmen. The Chairman of the Committee (who is actually one of the sponsors) asked if we could get a vote of the Board of Selectmen. Selectman F. Byron motioned that the Litchfield Board of Selectmen support adding Grassy Pond to the RSA 227 h: 5. Selectman G. Lambert seconded the motion. Selectman F. Byron stated that this does not change anything in terms of the relationship of this parcel to Litchfield overall. There are an additional 10 acres of land out there that is owned by the Town of Litchfield, it does not affect or change that ownership in any way. If the Town at some future wants to purchase the Grassy Pond parcel, we could still make an overture to the State. We would have to have the RSA changed but we could easily make the purchase provided the state wishes to sell. With the management system that is set up with the three groups: the Conservation Commission, the Nature conservancy as well as DES, that property will be protected and actually conserved as scientific study. There have been a huge number of scientific studies on that wetland that have been done in the 1990's. The motion carried 5-0-0. Selectman Byron would like to have some kind of letter written up on this and signed by the Board Chairman.

### **Warrant Review**

Warrant needs to be signed and posted by the end of day next Monday. If everyone is on board with what we have or there are any changes the Board would like to make tonight, Mr. Hoch can print and have the Board sign at the end of the meeting. Selectman Perry asked Mr. Hoch when people can sign up for the open positions that are going to be on the warrants. Administrator Hoch stated that this can be done next week. Selectman Perry stated that people can sign up for Moderator – 1 three year term, Selectman – 1 three year term, Budget Committee – 2 three year terms and 1 one year term, Checklist Supervisor – 1 six year term, Library Trustee – 1 three year term, Trustee of Trust Funds – 1 three year term and Cemetery Trustee – 1 three year term.

Selectman Byron wanted to go over the operating budget; the last meeting the Board had Mr. Byron raised the concern of the default budget and wanted to have the default budget reviewed and changes made. Selectman Brunelle stated that this was voted on at the last Selectmen's meeting. Selectman F.

Byron stated that he voted against the default budget, he was not in favor of the budget set forth yet his vote is listed as in favor of the budget. Selectman F. Byron motioned that the Board of Selectmen reopen Warrant Article 4 – The Town operating Budget. Selectman S. Perry seconded the motion. The motion to reopen carried 5-0-0.

Selectman G. Lambert motioned to reduce the default budget by \$37,000. Selectman F. Byron seconded the motion. Discussion: Selectman G. Lambert stated that he thinks that the default budget includes a reduction in our contingency which we have felt free to remove from the operating budget and since the operating budget is actually lower than the default budget, if the Town votes to give us a default budget rather than our operating budget then we are actually asking for more money than we are in our operating budget and thinks we should reduce the numbers and so the default budget which has a contingency fund that the Town did not put in its operating budget should actually be reduced from the default budget. Selectman F. Byron stated that his concern is that we have items that are in the default budget that are budgeted items from last year that we do not expect to expend this year and there are quite a few of those various items that are in there. We also have situations where we have reduced down to match what our expected expenditures are. It is Mr. Byron's opinion that we are following the RSAs in terms of how a default budget gets assembled; but he believes that past precedent of this board has been to eliminate and remove items from the default budget that we had no intention of expending and to not put them in the default budget. Selectman Brunelle asked that based on that motion, what would the default budget be. Selectman Byron stated that his only concern is that we are just taking \$37,000 off the line and that doesn't address the areas that need to be addressed. The money should be taken off line-by-line items instead of taking off a lump sum of \$37,000. Selectman Lemire stated that the intent of the RSA is not to go line by line. Selectman Lambert stated that the Board previously has had a procedure that if we go through and the voters give us the default budget the Board goes back and rebalances all of the budgets to spend within the means of the default budget, our existing procedure has always been that we are going to reorganize programs, initiatives based on the resources that the voters are going to give us. Selectman J. Brunelle stated that the rationale was that we presented a budget that was sound for the Town based on or known commitments and expenses, the budget committee reduced it additionally which is what the resulting operating budget request is, if we believe we can live in that budget no matter what, why not just make it the same. Selectman S. Perry made a motion to change the \$37,000 to \$17,300. Selectman J. Brunelle seconded the motion. Selectman S. Perry stated that the reason for the amendment and a second is that this would bring the default below the operating budget by \$68.00. Selectman G. Lambert stated that he believes that this doesn't give the voters a substantial difference between the two. If the amendment was defeated, Mr. Lambert would propose a secondary amendment for \$33,000 which is the exact amount of the contingency if that would get the Board to vote unanimously in that direction. The amendment failed 1-4-0. Selectman G. Lambert motioned to propose an amendment in the amount of \$33,000, the amount of contingency. Selectman B. Lemire seconded the amendment. The amendment passed 3-2-0. The amended main motion passed 4-1-0. The new default budget is \$4,931,196.00. Selectman B. Lemire motioned to recommend article 4. Selectman G. Lambert seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0-0.

Selectman S. Perry motioned to reopen Article 5 (Road Agent) for reconsideration. Selectman B. Lemire seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0-0.

Selectman G. Lambert motioned to remove Article 5 from the warrant. Selectman B. Lemire seconded the motion for discussion. Selectman G. Lambert stated that our multiple attempts in trying to craft Article around the Road Agent position have created a great deal of confusion in the community and believes people don't understand what this warrant is. Selectman J. Brunelle stated that he believes people are confusing the employee with the Road Agent, the Road Agent; we are only changing the Road Agent which is a stipend position, that is all we are changing so that the Board may appoint a qualified person, it has nothing to do with a part-time/full time staff, and believes that is where the confusion is. Selectman B. Lemire also stated that all it is is that we are making this an appointed position and would like to give the people the opportunity to vote on it, and would like to move it forward. Selectman J. Brunelle want to make sure that the people understand that this is not an employee going from part time to full time or that we are declaring a full time road agent; we are trying to change the existing position which is a stipend role (administrative only) to an appointed position so that we can ensure that we have somebody in a leadership role in that department. Selectmen Byron stated that this warrant was originally discussed at the request of Road Agent Pinciaro who it appears has changed his opinion of the need for this warrant. Selectman G. Lambert motioned for the Board of Selectman to remove Article 5 (Road Agent) from the warrant article. Selectman B. Lemire seconded. The motion carried 3-2-0.

Selectman G. Lambert motioned to remove the Recreation Department part time position (Article 9) from the warrant. The motion failed for lack of second.

Selectman B. Lemire stated that the Recreation Committee asked for help, and to put the warrant forward. Let the people vote on it. Selectman F. Byron pointed out to the Board that the Town voted in 1999 to form a Recreation Commission and in that approval granted the Recreation Commission the authority under RSA 35: b. This RSA grants the Recreation Commission full authority on their own, without coming to the Board of Selectmen and without going to Town Meeting to form contracts and if the Recreation Commission decides at any time that it wants to take and do a contract for a director of recreation, they are within their power as granted by the citizens of Litchfield to go and do so. The formation warrant article also granted the Recreation Commission the power to hire any employees that they deem needed. They do not need the current warrant article; they volunteered to go through the warrant article process.

## **Administrator Report**

### **New Business**

#### **Purchasing Policy**

Mr. Hoch stated that one of the things that came up in conversation at the Budget hearing was that there is confusion about why the Board was talking about amending the purchasing policy. We have identified a couple of concerns one being the 1996 Article has been governing this has tied the Board's hands pretty tightly in terms of dollar threshold; ability to waive, ability to buy on state bid, requiring newspaper noticing where it achieves nothing to get a competitive value for the tax payer but rather it wastes more taxpayer money. There were requirements that might have made sense then that were less relevant to the way we operate now. What Mr. Hoch did was to take the existing Purchasing Policy and

said what if that article passes in March, what are the kinds of approaches we would be taking so if we are generally feeling that this is the way we want to go we can explain to the voters that we are not going off the deep end. Mr. Hoch went through and retained the bulk of the policy, but shared with the Board the changes he has made. Right now we have a range of \$3,000 - \$7,500; the awarding of a competitive bid must be approved by Town Administrator and over \$7,500 to be approved by the Selectmen, Mr. Hoch moved this from \$7,500 to \$12,000. For purchases, the same thresholds that we have now; between \$3,000 and \$11,999 and over \$12,000, notably the language of the over \$12,000 section is slightly adjusted using a formal sealed bid, invitations for bid would be posted on the Towns website for at least 14 days, direct solicitation of qualified bidders is also allowed, invitations for bid may also be publicly advertised in the local newspaper as a record, relevant professional journals or applicable websites. The RFP/RFQ language the same situation; not just a newspaper but the other relevant places that would be appropriate for us to post. Buying things at auction; going from \$3,000 to \$12,000 being approval by the Administrator with looking at written quotes of like or similar product. Purchases over \$12,000 go to the Selectmen for approval. The ability of the Administrator to approve a purchase without bid for items under \$12,000 and Selectmen at a publicly notice meeting for items over \$12,000 with a specific list of exceptions those being State or Federal bid, sole source, specific type of brand supply or part that necessary, emergency situation, item previously awarded within the past 12 months, and purchases required through inter-governmental purchase. Selectman F. Byron stated that to him that the big issue with the 1996 warrant was not so much the \$7,500. He thinks the big issue with the 1996 warrant is that it was only for capital goods and it ignored such things as purchase of goods, standing purchase orders, services. A lot of the things that the Town contracts out that may be over \$7,500 are services, and none of this is covered in the 1996 warrant. We did cover it in our own Purchasing Policy and those types of things need to get straightened out and the other things is that it requires the Town to go and post in two newspapers of general circulation any bid for capital items above \$7,500. Administrator Hoch stated that the capital purchase for computer equipment, we technically satisfied the 1996 law by placing an ad in the newspaper and all we did was waste the tax payer's money under the premise of saving money and that is the situation where we need to have the flexibility and also we need to have a review of bid strategy. Selectman Byron stated that it is the same thing with State bids and explained to the viewers that the State of New Hampshire goes out and competitively bids for the purchase of different types of items; road salt, car and trucks, computers, etc. and you as a town can take advantage of getting the same price through the state bid. You are not going to get it cheaper because we are using the leveraging and the purchasing power of the State as well as the Towns associated with the state because there was an RSA put through that said that Towns and municipalities can tie into state bids. If we want to go out and purchase something that may be a state bid, we now have to go and put an ad in two newspapers, we have to go and try and collect the bids and give the sufficient time for the bids to remain open, all of which requires us to spend tax payers money to go and purchase something through the state bid program. Selectman J. Brunelle motioned to the Board of Selectmen to adopt this policy contingent on the article passing at Town Meeting. Selectman B. Lemire seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0-0.

**Old Business**  
**Fire Chief Recruitment and process**

Administrator Hoch stated that we have about 10 applications so far for the Fire Chief position and they continue to come in. Reviewing process with question is with Selectman Brunelle and Selectman Lemire. Administrator Hoch suggests blocking out time the week of February 13<sup>th</sup> for interviews. The subcommittee can meet around January 30<sup>th</sup>. The applications close on the 28<sup>th</sup> of January. Selectman S. Perry suggested the Board meet on Wednesday the 1<sup>st</sup> of February at 6:00 pm.

### **Upcoming Meeting Preparation**

Between now and the end of the month, Mr. Hoch would like to schedule some time with each of the members of the Board to put together slides and discussion points for the deliberative sessions.

### **Other Items**

SB 337 was referenced in last week's Legislative Bulletin – would allow property held by a municipality in another municipality for a water supply to be classified as open space land. There is an outgrowth of dispute between Manchester and Auburn. Representative Gandia came in last week to check if there was a concern here on that issue given that a similar situation exists with Hudson and Litchfield. Recall that Hudson pays us around \$30,000 in payments in lieu of taxes. The Town Administrator of Hudson and Administrator Hoch have discussed this – he can't imagine a situation where Hudson would exercise this. However, Boards change over time. Administrator Hoch asked if the Board has any feedback to pass through. Selectman Byron thinks losing income from the town would hurt, so he would not be in favor of losing income from the town. Selectman B. Lemire stated that he believes this bill is not a good bill and it should be defeated. Selectman F. Byron motioned that the Board of Selectmen hereby recommends to our State Senator that SB337 should be defeated. Selectman B. Lemire seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-1.

In previous weeks Mr. Hoch mentioned concerns involving HB 514. Representative Lambert helped to get the language amended to make sure that assessing functions can still occur.

Administrator Hoch met with Senator DeBlois and Representative Lambert on SB 212, which would have a major impact on the way we purchase insurance through LGC, Primex, etc. Selectman Byron stated that he was nominated and appointed to the NH Municipal Association's Committee on Governmental Affairs and will be starting to attend that in February and some of things the Board is talking about will come up during those discussions.

The Town Clerk had expressed preference to have the dog fees set for a full calendar year rather than just for part of the year. The recommendation is pulling together all fees for the Board of Selectmen to review at a properly noticed public hearing and set effective dates accordingly for any fees. Other departments have pointed out that some fees are in need of clarification or adjustment. Selectman G. Lambert stated that the hearing on the dog licensing happened in Concord today. There was a lot of commentary about the fact that we need to protect dogs and humans from rabies. The house last year removed the Town's liability for dogs so the need for the dog licensing fees is different than it was than before and the current cost to collect the fees is now as much as the fees themselves. A proposal was made to make sure that not only do we license dogs but to increase it to license cats as well to make sure

that we track cats because according to statistics there are more cats with rabies than there are dogs with rabies.

Selectman B. Lemire brought up to Representative Lambert that there has been a bill (HB 1669) filed to remove all dedicated funding for agencies such as the fire fund that funds the fire training and the police fund that funds the police standards and training. Selectman Lemire stated that personally this would send all the fire and police training operations back into the dark ages and dependent upon the general fund. Right now these operations are funded through fees that are collected from the insurance companies that request reports and this does not come out of the general fund. This bill to eliminate all dedicated funding would wipe these two accounts right out and eliminate the money going to the NH Fire Academy for fire training, emergency medical training and for the Police Standards and Training Fund. Mr. Lemire asked State Representative Lambert to check into this and this is something we should be in opposition to because this would affect our own local fire, police and emergency medical training. Representative Lambert stated that he did not sponsor that bill, and if it was the Board's wish, he would go and represent the Board as opposing this bill. Selectman B. Lemire motioned that the Board of Selectmen go on record as opposing HB 1669. Selectman J. Brunelle seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-1.

Administrator Hoch stated that the HB 1185 (Police Funding and Training Counsel) and right now finds that are collected and paid to the State are segmented so that 54.17% goes to the Police Standards and Training Counsel Training Fund. That would be removed and go into the general fund. This is one where Administrator Hoch and Chief O'Brion have talked about in the past and the concern being fines that are imposed that go through the State for Standards and Training is why they do not pay tuition to train Police Officers for standard training. The concern that we would have is if Police Standards and Training no longer has income coming in that there would be a cost shift of tuition back to towns to cover that. Selectman B. Lemire motioned that the Board of Selectmen go on record as opposing HB1185. Selectman J. Brunelle seconded the motion. Selectman G. Lambert stated that this particular bill is scheduled to ED and A then is submitted by the Chairman of ED and A, the Chairman of ED and A will have to step down and the Vice Chairman will actually go out and hold and record the hearing and it will come out of executive session not to pass. We will be going against the House on this one. The motion carried 4-0-1.

Selectman Lambert thanked the Board for taking an opinion on issues and would like the Board's support on his present bill, which is currently before the House to repeal all collective bargaining for State, municipal and school employees. Selectman S. Perry seconded the motion for discussion. Selectman B. Lemire stated that under no circumstances would he ever vote to repeal collective bargaining for employees. He believes it is way too extreme, and to remove that would be unconscionable. Selectman Lambert stated that he appreciated to be able to speak on this topic. Currently as the process of collective bargaining exists, the taxpayers of our community and other communities never get to have a seat at the table to have open discussion about the contents of what is in a collective bargaining agreement, there is never a public or open hearing, the procedure is actually an real interesting maze for which the public only gets and up or down vote and unless we repeal and rebuild the statutes in a way that actually represent to the public, the public will continually to be

disenfranchised as they have been disenfranchised for the last 35 years, so he would encourage the Board of Selectmen in Litchfield to support this particular initiative. Selectman Byron asked Selectman Lambert if this involves the right to work. Selectman Lambert stated no that actually what it does is make it so instead of guaranteeing exclusive bargaining for state employees it allows individual employees to contract with Towns municipalities and schools and gives us better resolution without actually having to have one bargaining unit represent the interest of a department. We have seen towns that have gone 3,4,5 and 6 years without getting a raise or contract because the Boards of Selectmen and the Bargaining teams come to an agreement give it to the voters, the voters turn it down and then you goes years without people actually getting a contract. Selectman Byron questioned Mr. Hoch saying that we have a vote in front of us that we will be voting on shortly to recommend to our Representatives that collective bargaining be removed from the RSAs and could that vote by the Board of Selectmen be in violation of any of our collective bargaining agreements with the Town's bargaining unit? Selectman Lambert stated that if this was a problem he would be happy to remove his motion if the other party removes the second. Administrator Hoch stated that he is not seeing an outright prohibition of the Board of Selectmen seeking to express a political opinion; on the other hand in a less collaborative environment this could be a concern. Selectman G. Lambert withdrew his motion. Selectman S. Perry withdrew his second.

Selectman Byron and Mr. Hoch will be presenting to the Derry, Londonderry and Hudson Chamber of Commerce on Thursday morning regarding economic development in Litchfield.

Administrator Hoch stated that in the informational items he passed along a letter regarding our participation in the States Mosaic Pilot Project which is a connection between the University of New Hampshire and the Department of Revenue who have been gathering this GIS based data make more usable tools for analyzing information regionally. We are part of their target area to participate, we will give them our data and they will give us access to shared regional data and tools to use that data. We should know more on that in the coming months. Selectman G. Lambert stated that it would be advantageous for the Town of Litchfield, which has a changing demographic based on our new bridge, to encourage participation on this project and would make a motion that Jason Hoch spend time trying to find out and keep track of when those seminars and discussions are and if he is available, to participate in those discussions and training to see how this may be useful. Selectman F. Byron seconded the motion. Selectman G. Lambert stated that he believes that his would be very helpful; he use to work in the GIS business and small changes have really big impacts. When we were talking about redistricting the other day, he said that when we had been redistricted with Merrimack a few years ago, that was a really huge issue because we were a disconnected community from Merrimack. With the new bridge this is not the case, we are now across the street from Merrimack, we are closer to Merrimack on a commuting basis from Town Hall then we are to Hudson's Town Hall, so these things will change our community and we should have access to the best tools to look study it. The motion carried 5-0-0. Administrator Hoch stated that one of the other things we participated in was some high resolution aerial photography, we have all of that data from NRPC and we actually ended up getting a bunch of data files printed and indexed which came at no additional cost to us from Northpoint Engineering who does our Highway Department engineering work..

### **Selectmen Committee and Community Reports**

Selectman G. Lambert stated that this Board had expressed some concerns over redistricting, the redistricting discussion got incredibly heated and Mr. Lambert represented the position of the Board as based on a letter that was previously communicated trying to get a better plan for both Litchfield and Hudson. At the end of the day, the contention was made that Litchfield as a community was the poster child for problems. There is a risk that the redistricting plans which would have been really good for Litchfield would probably have been thrown out by the courts. Based on that, the risk that we had a number of years ago put Litchfield in trouble because the court went and redistricted the whole State and left us without a representative of our own and put us together with Merrimack which left us for years without an actual representative elected from this community. The current plan ends up with us having two reps of our own and two from Manchester which is a better situation than the courts making the decision. It looks like we will have two representatives from Litchfield; and be in be a floatorial district with two representatives from Manchester/Litchfield. It looks like we will have the same Senate district as we had last time if the crossover actually happens and the House votes for the Senates proposal and the Senate votes for the House proposal.

### **Items moved from consent**

No items moved

### **Other Business**

Status of the GIS data: Already discussed by Administrator Hoch.

Recreation Coordinator: Selectman G. Lambert stated that whatever this Board decides, we need to make a compelling argument to the voters, and he does not believe the Board has actually done that. Selectman G. Lambert motioned to reopen the Recreation Coordinator warrant. Selectman F. Byron seconded the motion. Selectman G. Lambert stated that he would really like if we can go back and ask the Recreation Department to give us the back ground so that we can go make a compelling argument at Deliberative Session to support this article so that the voters will actually have a solid case for us to make as to why this is the right thing to do and he would like their help in passing this article and having all of that information from them to the voters so that we can say we made the decision not in a vacuum or just because it is a nice thing to do but because it is a current felt need for the Town. Selectman J. Brunelle stated that we already made a decision to have the Recreation Commission present this warrant at deliberative to explain the needs and to sell it. Selectman S. Perry stated that he made the request and they said okay, but he said that he would do it if they decided not to. The basic premises are that the Recreation Commission feels that they are a group of volunteers; they do not get paid to do the things that need to be done on a daily basis. If we paid someone a small amount of money for the equivalent of five hours per week, we could get somebody to do everything that needs to be done, which is monitor the status of Talent Hall on a daily basis, set the schedule for the hall, evaluate the parks, make sure that vandalism isn't happening and things like that. They want someone who can start setting up programs and all of the administrative stuff that is taking up time and that the commission members are running out of time to do. They feel for the Town to expand any further they need to have this position in place so that they can continue to grow. Selectman F. Byron agrees with Selectman Perry that the Recreation Commission has to speak for this at the Deliberative Session, and also believes they already have the ability to contract for this outside of the scope of the Board of Selectmen. The Board of Selectmen has

no authority in regards to their ability to contract, it is up to them. It was given to them by the citizens of Litchfield. We have to abide by that and if they are saying that they need someone to help them then we should send it to the voters. Selectman G. Lambert withdrew his motion. Selectman F. Byron withdrew his second.

**Public Comment**

Litchfield resident John York came forward and stated that the Board of Selectmen voted on supporting two legislative actions where the concern was that tax dollars would go from a funding and be put back into the general fund and his question would be since Litchfield is not a very large town with only 24 part time firemen and a dozen police officers that the cost of training those police officers may actually be cheaper to the Townspeople to pay it ourselves. Selectman G. Lambert stated that this is not true. Right now these training programs are funded by fees not tax payer dollars. The problem is eliminating that would cause these to be funded by tax payer dollars and then they would be at the mercy of the legislature. Mr. York stated that he did not realize that this was a fee base program.

Selectman J. Brunelle motioned to adjourn the public portion of the meeting. Selectman B. Lemire seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0-0. The Board will come out of non-public to adjourn. The public portion of the meeting adjourned at 9:17.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Steven D. Perry, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
John R. Brunelle, V. Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Frank A. Byron

\_\_\_\_\_  
George A. Lambert

\_\_\_\_\_  
Brent T. Lemire