

1. Non Public Session and meeting with counsel

The Board convened in the Wheelwright Room for a meeting with town counsel at 6:15 p.m. Chairman Quandt then convened the regular meeting. Selectman Clement made a motion to go into non public session under the exception of employee compensation. Selectman Ferraro seconded. Roll call vote: Gilman aye, Ferraro aye, Clement aye, Quandt aye, Chartrand aye.

2. Regular Business Meeting

Chairman Matt Quandt re-convened the Board at 7:00 pm in the Nowak Room of the Town Office. Other members of the Board present were Selectman Frank Ferraro, Vice Chairman Don Clement, Selectman Dan Chartrand, Selectwoman Julie Gilman and Town Manager, Russ Dean

3. Public Comment

Alan Bailey of Green Street comes forward to inquire about the quarterly finance report. He wonders if the status of the audit will be discussed this evening. Chairman Quandt indicates the finance report is on the agenda for this evening and this will include an audit update.

4. Minutes & Proclamations

a. Regular Meetings: July 9, 2012

These minutes are not available for this evening.

b. Proclamation: Kiwanis Day

Mr. Chartrand announces the Board of Selectman Proclamation of Kiwanis Week for the week of July 23rd, 2012. In honor of the Kiwanis Club's continuous efforts to improve the community and their demonstration of concern for the interest in the youth of the community. The Kiwanis Club is celebrating 32 years of service this year.

5. Appointments – Budget Recommendations Committee, Arts Committee

Mr. Clement moves to appoint Robert Corson to the Budget Recommendations Committee for the remainder of the year. Mr. Chartrand Seconds. Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Clement moves to appoint Rawson Webb to the Arts Committee with a term to expire on April 30, 2015. Mr. Chartrand Seconds. Vote: Unanimous

6. Discussion / Action Items

a. New Business

i. Quarterly Financial Report

Doreen Ravell, Director of Finance comes forward to present the financial report for the second quarter. Ms. Ravell first responds to Mr. Bailey's question regarding the Town Audit. She indicates the auditors were in last week. They had first appeared in the month of May to begin the audit and due to scheduling conflicts, they returned in the month of July. The auditors are currently working in the field to finalize all the remaining questions and it is unknown at this time when the report will be available.

Ms. Ravell indicates the financial reports are available for review in the packet and the Year to Date end

BOARD OF SELECTMAN

BOARD OF SELECTMAN DRAFT MINUTES

JULY 23, 2012

is at 6.30. She reports the revenue in the general fund is relatively flat with 50% collected. Ms. Ravell notes that permits are especially active between PEA and the Cobham expansion in the second quarter there was a lot of activity to boost the revenue. Ms. Ravell notes that while the Water & Sewer appear to be weak, it's not an actual decline. The figures represent and are reflective of the Water & Sewer credits issued in the first quarter and the fund is actually on par for the year. Included in the financial report are the EMS Revolving Fund and Parks and Recreation Revolving Fund. She notes that it is currently the seasonal time of business increase for Parks and Recreation and the fund is currently at 80% collected. The EMS fund is currently at 29% collected. This number may appear low, but it reflects the new startup with the new billing company. She reflects that the insurance companies have yet to reimburse the town.

Mr. Ferraro questions the report line for Other Permits and Fees. He asks what percentage of the estimated revenues is from the general fund portion of the Cable Committee. He believes this should be close to \$125,000, as the fee went up this year. Mr. Dean indicates he can not recall exactly what has come in so far and that what's estimated in total should be approximately \$200,000 of which \$100,000 is General Fund. Ms. Ravell confirms that the approximate Other Permits and Fees not counting the Cable Fund will be around \$25,000.

Mr. Ferraro inquires on the EMS Ambulance Transport Revenue. He believes the revenues in the Revolving Fund were supposed to be used to pay for the expenses approved by the Board of Selectmen, and 95% of the remainder would go to the General Fund. Mr. Dean reports that \$230,000 in projected revenue was reviewed and projected against the expenses. He further comments that the initial twelve month number needs to be realized before any funds are exchanged. It is unclear what percentage rate would be exchanged to the General Fund. Mr. Ferraro indicates he is not looking for a fixed dollar amount; he is looking for the percentage rate at which was agreed to be transferred to the General Fund. Mr. Dean agrees to look into it and provide an answer for Mr. Ferraro.

Ms. Ravell reports the expenses from the General Fund are at 49% spent. This is mostly due to fixed costs of salaries and benefits. She further reports the vehicle replacements are almost fully expended. The Water & Sewer expenses are at 42% spent. This number reflects the timing of variable costs like the roof replacement and the meters, paired with seasonal costs of natural gas and things of that nature.

Her general overview report for Property Tax Collections as of June 30, 2012, when taxes were due was at 76% collected. Two days later, on July 2, the number increased to 90%. There is also a decrease in what has been outstanding in the lien years with the deeding and tax liens. She reflects this is partially due to properties that couldn't be deeded due to bankruptcies. Mr. Ferraro asks how many properties that reflects in the years 2005 – 2008. Ms. Ravell believes that to be 1 or 2 mobile homes. Mr. Dean confirms he does not believe there are any properties that far into the past that were not related to a bankruptcy. The number of properties for the years 2009 – 2010 is unavailable at this time. Mr. Dean advises that deeding is triggered back two years and one day and the deeding process will begin again soon. Mr. Clement notes it is a long and painful process and wonders how many properties are eligible? Mr. Dean can not confirm an exact number and agrees to update the Board next month. Mr. Ferraro asks if the 90 day letters have gone out to prior home owners from the recent deeding that has taken place. Mr. Dean confirms the repurchase letters have gone out to previous home owners.

Ms. Ravell reports the Water & Sewer overall reflects a decrease in the accounts receivables. This is directly related to increased collection efforts. Monthly notices are coming out as quickly as possible.

She reports that in March, 2012 the aging reflected approximately 49% uncollected and the current number is 33%.

ii. Assessing Department: Camper Tax Issue

John DeVittori, Town Assessor comes forward to present the topic of a travel trailer tax. He wishes to apprise the Board of required valuations prior to the Camper Tax issue. He reports that Town Valuations are required every five years; all municipalities are required to update their values. The last time valuations were performed was April 1, 2010 and this is reflected in the present tax base. He advises the Board will need to decide what they wish to do for the required valuations approaching in 2015. There are three basic options available. Mr. DeVittori describes the first option as an in house option. He can conduct an in-house statistical update to the valuations at no additional cost to the Town of Exeter. The second option is described as a reassessment, much like what was performed in 2010. He estimates the cost for the reassessment from the firm that completed the job in 2010 will cost approximately \$100,000. The third option is described as an assessment in full capacity. This would include field inspections on every property. This option is described as very labor intensive and carries an estimated cost of \$225,000. He advises this decision needs to be made in the near future.

Mr. Clement asks if the full assessment can be performed by Vision, the contracted company from the reassessment in 2010. Mr. DeVittori indicates it can be. Mr. Chartrand asks when the last full revaluation was performed. Mr. DeVittori reports that the last full revaluation was in 1997 and regardless of which option is chosen, the task must be complete by the close of 2015. Mr. DeVittori does not have a preferable recommendation at this time. He notes that he performs a monthly sales analysis and the current median is at 1.07 based upon 234 legitimate sales from April 1, 2011 to April 1, 2012. Mr. Chartrand wonders if that number can be applied to the old valuations. Mr. DeVittori does not feel this would be an accurate reflection or valid option. The valuations are based on the property type and the current median is not proportional to that. Mr. Dean advises that these options have not been discussed in quite some time and in order to facilitate a full revaluation funding needs to be set aside over the course of the next few fiscal years. Mr. DeVittori reminds the Board that the choice must be made soon, since the law indicates the valuation must be complete by the end of 2015.

Mr. Clement remembers the reassessment was performed in 2010 and asks Mr. DeVittori what was done previous to that. Mr. DeVittori indicates he had performed the valuations in-house for the prior sixteen years to 1997, and this included the assessed value and an approximate market value. In 1997 a full evaluation was performed and in 2010 a reassessment was performed by Vision. Chairman Quandt agrees to add this topic to a future agenda for more discussion.

Mr. DeVittori, Town Assessor presents the topic of Taxation of Travel Trailers for discussion with the Board. He advises that in recent months, the State of New Hampshire has been encouraging the Cities and Towns to place a tax upon permanently place trailers such as travel trailers. He advises that Hampton Beach as a municipality has been taxing seasonal and non seasonal trailers as permanent dwellings for some time. He defines "permanent" as completely enclosed, used as a dwelling or store house or shelter, and intentions to have the unit remain stationary. There are currently two campgrounds in Exeter. Mr. DeVittori estimates there are between 12 and 20 trailers in each of the campgrounds that would be eligible to be taxed. One of the campgrounds is located partially in Exeter in partially in Kensington. At present, Kensington is not currently taxing these types of structures; however they will begin to do so effective April 1, 2013.

Mr. DeVittori advises the Board they will need a complete inventory prior to April 1, 2013 and describes the process the assessment valuation. For example, a 2010 model that is eight feet wide and thirty-two feet long and is permanently fixed at a campground would have an estimated value of \$9,000. At the current local tax rate, that would equate to about \$227 annually. The tax bill would be sent to the campground owner and distributed to each individual trailer renter. The Director of the Department of Revenue will be speaking at the Annual Campers Association meeting to reinforce this campground law, building tax and travel trailer tax.

He describes the things the Board should consider prior to executing the law. A non payment of the tax bill will execute a lien on the camper. After two years of delinquency the Town of Exeter will own the unit and it will need to be disposed of. He is concerned that campers may stake the claim of residency in the State of NH since they receive and pay a tax bill here. Mr. Ferraro does not believe the claim to residency will be a problem since the unit does not qualify as a permanent residence. He notes that local business owners don't necessarily live in Town and cannot claim residency here. Mr. DeVittori notes that he has prepared a cost benefit analysis and notes should this law be enforced. Mr. Chartrand indicates that the estimated \$227 times forty units will generate less than \$10,000. Mr. Ferraro interjects that it may not make a lot of sense, but it is in fact the law and there is no choice except compliance. Mr. Chartrand asks if the Supreme Court ruling indicated this law as a must or as a law to enforce at the discretion of the Town.

Chairman Quandt indicates there was a ruling that said a Town can and there was a follow up decision from the DRA indicating it must be adhered to. Mr. Clement questions the process of the assessment and notes it is a law and must be followed. Mr. DeVittori indicates the complete assessment must be complete prior to April 1, 2013. Mr. Clement asks how the criteria can be met if a unit is moved from site to site in a campground, can it therefore still be declared a permanent structure? Chairman Quandt indicates there have been no court rulings to address that question. Mr. Clement asks Mr. DeVittori to clarify. If a trailer is on a site in 2013 and on the exact same site when the assessment is performed in 2014, this would meet the criteria. Mr. DeVittori indicates that this would require annual check backs including measurements, photos and detailed listings. Mr. Clement asks if the campground owner would qualify to go through the abatement process. Mr. DeVittori indicates that as this is not the permanent residence of the unit owner or renter, they could qualify for abatement but could not get the service credit.

Mr. Ferraro points out that the issue has been discussed with Town Counsel and they did not indicate that this was optional. Per Supreme Court Decision for RSA 72.7, if the trailer constitutes a building it must be taxed. Mr. DeVittori indicates there is some gray area in the law and points out that some towns are doing it and some are not. It's the DRA that is coming through and indicating every Town must comply. Mr. Ferraro clarifies that it is not the interpretation; it's the DRA that is now enforcing the statute. Mr. Chartrand consults the Town Manager, asking if Mr. Dean has any ideas on how to avoid having Town Employees waste time and money chasing this statute down. Mr. Dean indicates that there are at least two Towns enforcing the statute and he would be interested in knowing what other Towns are or are not doing with the Statute. Mr. Clement wonders if the assessor even has the authority to go on the premises to perform the inventory. Mr. DeVittori indicates he would need to have permission from the land owner and if the land owner does not wish to allow him on the property there are other avenues that can be explored to force compliance.

Mr. Clement would like to see this topic come onto the agenda again prior to the end of the year pending the idea that new legislation in the fall. Mr. DeVittori intends to get in touch with the campground owners to begin pursuing compliance with the statute. Mr. Ferraro suggests Mr. DeVittori check in with the Town of Kensington to see how they're planning to pursue the compliance with the statute. He expresses that this statute could in fact end up costing more money than the Town will make in taxes collected, but it is a law and the Town of Exeter must comply. Mr. Chartrand points out that the actual Supreme Court decision uses the verbiage "Can" not "Must" and that whether this statute is required for enforcement is debatable. He believes it's the decision of the DRA, not the Supreme Court, that this statute suddenly be enforced. Chairman Quandt notes that new legislation regarding this topic can not be depended upon and agrees to add it to the agenda at a future date.

iii. Swasey Trustees – BOS Liaison Discussion

Chairman Quandt indicates that the Swasey Trustees have asked the Board of Selectmen for a Selectman's liaison. The next meeting of the Swasey Trustees is scheduled for August 1 at 3pm at the Public Works Office. Mr. Clement was the previous Selectman's Representative for the Trustee's. Chairman Quandt points out that he has never attended a Trustee meeting and he intends to go to the upcoming one. Mr. Clement also volunteers to be the liaison, and notes the Trustee's have become better at posting notice of upcoming meetings. He also notes that the recording of minutes at these meetings has been an issue in the past also. Mr. Chartrand indicates he would also be interested in becoming the liaison also. Mr. Clement notes there is a natural balance between the Park and the Parkway Road which is under the authority of the Board of Selectman. The Board consensus is that it's alright to appoint a Selectman's Representative to the Trustee's and one will be selected at a later time.

b. Old Business

i. 47 Front Street Roof

Mr. Dean explains that the bids for the project of the slate roof at 47 Front Street have come in at almost double the budgeted amount for the project. The original estimate worked with was based on information from Crocker Architectural. From that was the inclusion of a time line in 2010 that wasn't part of the budget in 2011 and then it came into the CIP. The Consultant was enlisted and the forensic inspection report was included in the packet. Based upon those findings, a bid spec was developed and in between the time of the report and the town warrant, the budget was reduced, based on the knowledge at that time contained in the forensic inspection report. The project was approved, the specification was written by the same consultant, and the bids came in at the last meeting way above the original budget. The spec is included in the packet and the original project quote for comparison. The project can't be accomplished the way it's been bid. Mr. Smart has talked with a few of the bidders and there might be an alternative.

Mr. Kevin Smart, superintendent of maintenance comes forward to present more information on the topic. Mr. Smart notes that the original spec calls out every aspect for a high end slate roof and along with that, comes a price tag. Each item adds to the price of the job and the end result is a high end job. He notes he has worked with Mr. Fulmer with past projects. Mr. Smart believes that the spec can be tailored to reduce the scope of work to a manageable project inside the budget. If we were to remove all the slate that is currently there, in conjunction with the copper that is failing and has caused the slate to fail as well, and redo the perimeter, gutters and new copper, this would leave the large stable areas in tact. One of the bidders has sent a revised quote which is significantly less in price. He believes with a

BOARD OF SELECTMAN

BOARD OF SELECTMAN DRAFT MINUTES

JULY 23, 2012

revised scope of work and a new bid request to the 4 bonafide bidders, a reasonable outcome can be attained. He believes this would result in a satisfactory roof repair that could take us into the foreseeable future.

Mr. Dean notes that in the financial aspect, if the funds of the warrant article went unspent it would lapse into the general fund surplus or be set aside and additional funds could be added as required. Mr. Clement notes the cost is a long way from \$117,900. He wonders where the huge price difference can be to explain the double in the cost, specifically what materials were under priced. Mr. Smart notes the cost of copper has gone up. He is confident the explanation to the cost increase was the spec in its very specific form. Ms. Gilman notes a Consultant was hired to get the forensic audit and that Consultant worked on the scope of work and wonders why those two things not come together. There is an estimate from these two bidders, but neither talk about labor, would that again double or triple the cost? Mr. Smart indicates that labor is a huge factor when the spec is as specific as it is currently written. The original spec would be requiring extreme labor, as the details are very labor intensive. Mr. Smart also points out that the dollar figure for the new spec could prove to provide a little discretion with the Contractor. The current spec is letter by letter how the repair would be performed, by tailoring the spec for discretion at the funding threshold; the project can be completed inside the budget.

Mr. Ferraro points out that the revised bid does not call out labor, it only indicates demo of all and install of new. He wonders if this implies the labor is built into the cost. He also agrees with Ms. Gilman, the current spec is very detailed but the person who developed the spec gave an estimate. There is a missed communication somewhere and he does not believe it to be the fault of the Town of Exeter. He expresses his concern that the original statement was for \$100,000. Now the result is that to do the roof, they need to replace what is necessary only and use the old slate as possible. The indication is that 80% of the roof can stay how it is and the cost is not going to reflect that change. He would prefer the entire project be rebid altogether as opposed to only asking for revised bids from the current bidders. Mr. Smart notes this bid was put out to prequalified bidders and the four companies that have previously bid will get the chance to rebid. They are all qualified in Historic Details and this building is a Historic Landmark. Mr. Ferraro clarifies that this will be a new RFP for a new bid and Mr. Smart agrees that it would be. He notes the revised scope would be sent out. Ms. Gilman asks if the bid was published for the public, aside from the prequalified bidders and if the bid is formally recast, would those prequalified bidders be able to revise their bids. Mr. Smart indicates the bid would be open to anyone and expresses his concern about the quality of bidders who are not prequalified and the quality of the work that might be performed.

Ms. Gilman asks him to clarify if the project will now be done in phases. Mr. Smart indicates it will not, it will be a project from start to finish until it's complete without phasing. Mr. Clement agrees with Mr. Ferraro and expresses his disappointment. He is concerned that a warrant article was presented to the tax payers indicating that it was important to fix the roof and asking for \$99,000 and now the fee has gone up. After further assessment it's now been determined the fee has gone up and we're planning to do something else instead of what was actually spec'd. He wonders where the confidence in that project is at this point. He feels the roof needs to be fixed and it should be historically correct and should be reasonable for the foreseeable future. Mr. Clement notes he has little confidence that for \$40,000 the project may be able to be complete and he is ready to scrap the project and begin again with an entirely new fresh start. Mr. Ferraro notes the flashing and repairs would be performed and this would leave the bulk of the roof in place. The vendor is only offering a warranty on the work, and not the entire roof. In

going back to the first consideration of 15% of the slate on the roof needed to be replaced. In his perspective that meant 15% of the slate in the roof needed replacement and that 15% was scattered throughout the roof. Thus old slate would come out and be replaced. Mr. Smart notes that will be clearly defined in the new spec and he expects a full warranty at the completion of the project.

Mr. Chartrand notes that these types of scenarios happen all the time in the real world. He does not feel as though throwing all the work already performed aside and starting over is the best choice. He feels there is a way to go forward and get a tight roof, as opposed to the current roof that is leaking and causing damage now. He does not wish for the perfect to interfere with the good. Mr. Smart indicates the DPW would like to proceed by presenting a revised scope of work. Mr. Ferraro agrees with Mr. Chartrand and also doesn't wish to let perfection become the enemy of good. He raises the point he raised last year and notes that an alternative roof would come in at way under the article price. He would like to see a new RFP and also notes that with a warranty he projects the cost to come back at \$150,000 or more. He would like to see an RFP that looks at an alternative roof. Mr. Smart does not believe that an alternative roof would come in at less than the current warrant for \$100,000. Mr. Chartrand and Ms. Gilman agree that this is a Historical Building and an alternative roof should not even be a consideration. Chairman Quandt asks Mr. Smart to present a new RFP and the topic will go back on the agenda at a later date.

Victoria Arlen – Special Guest

Mr. Dean presents Ms. Victoria Arlen of Exeter. He introduces her to the Board as a contender in the Paralympics Games. Ms. Arlen is a new world record holder, three times. Ms. Arlen thanks Mr. Dean for the introduction and notes that she is the IPC world record holder in the Women's 400 meter and 100 meter freestyle along with her new three World Records. Ms. Arlen indicates she has been a swimmer for some time and in the last few months especially. She went to Bismarck, ND for the Paralympics swimming trials and ended up successfully retaining two World Records and making the US Team with several Pan American records. She smiles and advises she's just the girl who started beating International Superstars Records and it's been excellent. She has been training hard and has seen a lot of support from the community. The Paralympics begin August 29th and go through September 9th. Mr. Dean expresses his congratulations to the newest celebrity of the Town of Exeter and presents a plaque recognizing her accomplishments with best wishes from the Board, the Town Manager, and the Town. The Board of Selectmen congratulates her on her Record setting swimming and wishes her the best of luck in the 2012 Paralympics in London.

ii. Baggage Building Project Update

Mr. Dean indicates that Sylvia Von Aulock has arrived to present this topic. He praises her diligent management of this project and notes she has done her best to assist with the entire process. He summarizes the project as having been approved in 2011 and the Town has received a grant from the Transportation Program and the requirements of the grant have been modified in the process. He also notes that if the project is not off the ground and running under contract by the end of 2012, the \$71,260 is encumbered for twelve months. If the funds go unused they will lapse and need to be re-appropriated for train station improvements. Mr. Ferraro questions if the funds do lapse, would they go to the general fund and still be available to re-appropriate under a new warrant article. Mr. Dean indicates that they can be and that Ms. Von Aulock has a significant update for this project. Ms. Gilman notes the amount of documentation and procedure, under the modified requirements is unbelievable and also points out these

are federal guideline changes in mid-project.

Sylvia Von Aulock, Town Planner presents her summary of the modification relating to the grant. She explains that she recently attended a seminar and two day training as a requirement for this type of grant. Due to some very big projects, such as the big dig, that has gone somewhat awry, there is a new over intensity of grant procedure. She explains this as a one size fits all administration grant that was written in 2009 and there was no warning these changes would come about. It took several weeks to get an answer from the DOT and it can be summarized as a long term project. The first thing that will happen is the schedule and budget being approved officially. Once approved, the preliminary engineering can begin. At that time, the Town could approach the hiring process with a projection date in August. No consultant could be hired before April of 2013 because of the intensive review processes and unbelievable administration. She feels an expert in this grant application could be necessary. Ms. Von Aulock notes the first time a violation of the procedure is found, every penny of the grant must be paid back. She predicts final design would be around November or December of 2013.

Ms. Von Aulock also indicates that in this time frame simultaneously, the historic cultural review and the environmental review would be completed. The right of way would start and that process, if approved, would start in November or December. There would need to be two contract appraisers, one to appraise the building and one to review the appraisal. Chairman Quandt asks if all of the administrative costs would fall into the grant. Ms. Von Aulock hopes that is case. In summary she projects the appraisal completion in June of 2014 and negotiations can begin in August of 2014. She advises the Board that no negotiations can take place between now and then, including any discussion with the property owner. There would also need to be a lot line adjustment that she predicts would take the project into 2015. She predicts construction can start in November or December 2014 and be completed with ground breaking in December 2015. This would give an approximate ribbon cutting in July 2016.

The members of the Board all agree this is very disappointing. Ms. Gilman notes that this would mean the entire project must be designed the property can even be purchased. Ms. Von Aulock advises the Board there could be other monies available to support this project and reminds the Board that this Warrant Article was very successful. Chairman Quandt asks for suggestion from the Board should the grant application be determined to go unused. Mr. Dean indicates there are processes for Capital Projects and those can be reviewed for an alternative. Mr. Clement offers his gratitude to the efforts of Ms. Von Aulock.

Chairman Quandt would like to continue the discussion of signs from the previous meeting. Mr. Ferraro indicates he was unable to attend the July 9 meeting but did watch the entire meeting. He notes there was a discussion on the Women's Club requesting permission to put up signs. He reflects on a previous request from a group with a music program at CMS that was approved. He thanks the Women's Club for making the official request. He notes there is a provision added to the Downtown merchant ordinances that require prior approval for sidewalk sales. The purpose of the provision was to prevent merchants from declaring every day a sidewalk sale. Mr. Chartrand agrees to point that out at the next Merchant Meeting he attends.

Chairman Quandt presents an item that came to the attention of the Board late last week. Regarding Option B for the interceptor that was approved at the last meeting. A letter came to the Town Office from the attorney of the Housing Authority. He requests the Town Manager go to the next Housing Authority

meeting as he believes there is a miscommunication. Mr. Dean advises that at the last meeting the option B was approved by the Board and, subsequent to that, the Housing Authority was contacted to give them the layout of the project. A letter was received and the construction easement is going to be problematic. Mr. Dean advises that the map shows the project including the original option and there were some issues with dewatering and chemicals which led to option B. Option B is a 24 inch PVC pipe to replace the existing line above it which is reduced in size. At this time option A is not viable. Mr. Dean further explains the existing easements with the Housing Authority have been reviewed. He reminds the Board they were transferred over thirty years ago and the current sewer easement is in place. In review of all of the options, option B would be the preferred option and that's what has been presented to the Board of Selectmen and Housing Authority. He advises the letter mentions three things. The location of the diversion structure, the man hole covers in the parking lot and a concern with environmental issues. The DPW finds it manageable and would hope a successful agreement from the Housing Authority can be attained.

Mr. Ferraro addresses Paul Vlasich, asking if there are two 12 inch lines that feed into an 18 inch line. Mr. Vlasich indicates there are two 18 inch lines under the building. The 12 inch line will be replaced a 24 inch line and as it stands is currently undersized. Mr. Ferraro asks if the current lines are one of the reasons for frequent CSO's. Mr. Vlasich indicates the undersized pipe could be responsible for some of the CSO's and in option B there is a new diversion. Mr. Chartrand asks if option C must be adopted would this cause the abandonment of the diversion structure. Mr. Vlasich indicates it would be left alone and they would need to return to it at a later time. Mr. Clement clarifies that option A and option B would include a new diversion structure and in both cases the structure will be under the parking lot. Mr. Vlasich confirms this and indicates there will be only two manhole covers visible. Mr. Chartrand asks if B is preferable to A because of the pumping of water or if there is some issue with coal gas and averting disturbing those things? Mr. Vlasich indicates with the increased ground water, the cost would be over budget and option B requires less pumping greatly due to less distance for the water to travel.

Mr. Ferraro asks if going with option B would allow the project completion date to remain October 1. Mr. Vlasich indicates it would be complete on schedule. Mr. Ferraro also notes that Mr. Vlasich referred to any extra funding in a previous memo requesting it be used to put sleeves in the 18 inch lines. Mr. Vlasich indicates the lines were cleaned and tv'd and sleeves are desirable as the pipes are concrete. Mr. Chartrand advises he would like to attend the meeting on August 2 at the Housing Authority. Mr. Vlasich also advises that the Housing Authority will decide if the easement will be granted by them and they had previously agreed to option A with little or no complaint.

7. Regular Business

a. Bid Openings – None this evening.

b. A/P and Payroll Manifests

Mr. Chartrand moves a Weekly Payroll warrant for checks date 7/11/2012 in the amount of \$169,679.66. Mr. Clement Seconds. Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Chartrand moves an Accounts Payable warrant for checks dated 7/13/2012 in the amount of \$327,092.46. Mr. Clement Seconds. Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Chartrand moves an Accounts Payable warrant for checks dated 7/20/2012 in the amount of \$448,481.94. Mr. Clement Seconds. Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Chartrand moves a Weekly Payroll Warrant for a check dated 7/20/2012 in the amount of \$388.13. Mr. Clement Seconds. Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Chartrand moves an Accounts Payable warrant for checks dated 7/20/2012 in the amount of \$2,714,695.00. Ms. Gilman Seconds. Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Chartrand moves a Capital Funds Payable warrant for checks dated 7/20/2012 in the amount of \$325,915.25. Ms. Gilman Seconds. Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Ferraro questions the payee of the check. Mr. Chartrand advises it is to J. Polito & Sons.

Mr. Chartrand moves a Weekly Payroll warrant for checks dated 7/18/2012 in the amount of \$236.38. Ms. Gilman Seconds. Vote: Unanimous.

c. Budget Updates

Mr. Dean advises that the Budget Committee met last week. The six month year to date financials were reviewed and he feels the Town is pretty much on target for the year so far.

d. Tax Abatements & Exemptions

Mr. Chartrand moves a warrant for collections of yield tax for map 88, lot 5 in the amount of \$180.31. Ms. Gilman Seconds. Vote: Unanimous

e. Water / Sewer Abatements – None this Evening

f. Permits – None this Evening

g. Town Manager's Report

Mr. Dean is happy to report the website work continues and the design has been given to the Town Offices. It will be sent to the members of the Board to review. He reports a new process is in the works for a dog warrant. He advises the Town Clerk has come up with something similar to the lines of civil forfeiture process and it has great potential. Once the process has been reviewed it will come before the Board for suggestions or approval.

Mr. Dean would like to express his gratitude to the DPW for working with the pressure issues that arose last week. He praises their hard work and notes they did an excellent job trouble shooting and repairing the cause quickly and efficiently. Any person driving down Front Street can see the patch work and if you drive down Pine Street you can see some of that work also. At this point everyone should have good pressure back. Mr. Dean is also pleased to report the great success of the Festival on Saturday. He notes the weather was perfect and he would like to thank the planning committee for putting the Festival together and the Parks and Recreation Department for a great show and a spectacular fireworks display.

Mr. Ferraro also offers his congratulations to all of the success for all those involved in the festival. He reflects on a visit to the Town of Durham recently by President Obama. He advises Mr. Dean that the

Town of Durham had calculated how much it would cost and has submitted an invoice to the Obama Campaign for reimbursement. He asks Mr. Dean if an invoice is planned for the visit recently to the Town of Exeter by Vice President Joe Biden. Mr. Dean indicates he did look into an invoice and is waiting to hear back from Chief Kane. Much of that event was reported as regular time and he admits when he saw the figures from the Town of Durham he was surprised. He feels if there had been a substantial cost to the Town of Exeter, the Chief of Police would have advised him. Mr. Dean agrees to check in again with the Police Chief and also with DPW.

h. Legislative Update – None this Evening

i. Selectman's Committee Reports

Mr. Ferraro reports he attended a Water and Sewer Advisory Committee Meeting and there was a review of financials and an update on the Jady Hill Project. He notes there was conversation directly relating to sump pumps and it turns out one house was identified with seven sump pumps in it.

Mr. Clement reports a Conservation Commission meeting in which there was a review of the Jady Hill project. He also attended an RPC meeting in which a population projection for Rockingham County was discussed. He notes that there is a dip in population predicted over the course of the next 30 years with unemployment projections of a 1% growth over the next 30 years.

Mr. Chartrand reports he was unable to attend the Exeter Economic Development Commission. He also reports a chicken dinner presented by the Exeter Retail Store Owners Association that was a large success.

Ms. Gilman reports a Heritage Commission meeting in which the mapping survey results were discussed. She also reports she has approached Senator Shaheen to discuss the cost of the Wastewater Treatment Facility and hopes the Senator can assist with locating additional funds for the project.

Chairman Quandt has nothing to report.

j. Correspondence

A letter from Christopher Suprock, PhD tending his resignation to the Technology Committee.

A letter from Leona Nelson regarding a basketball hoop located on Peach Street. She was given permission by the previous residents to remove the hoop from the residence and requests the permission of the Town to enter the property to remove it. The Board consensus is that Ms. Nelson may have the hoop and Mr. Dean agrees to get in touch with her to let her know she may have it.

An email from Frank Ferraro regarding a volunteer of the year award.

A letter from Charlotte Taylor regarding the excellent work of the DPW with a sewer blockage problem she encountered.

A letter from the DHHS Office of Business Operations regarding a Financial Monitoring Report.

A letter from Exeter Healthcare notifying the Town that they are closing their business.

A letter from the City of Portsmouth to the Conservation Law Foundation regarding the Right to Know law 91-A.

A letter from the State of New Hampshire DOT regarding the Exeter Highway Block Grant amounts awarded to the Town of Exeter.

8. Review Board Calendar

The Board will meet again in two weeks on Monday, August 6, 2012.

9. Adjournment

Ms. Gilman moves to adjourn. Mr. Clement Seconds. Vote: Unanimous

The Board stood adjourned at 9:21p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Pond
Recording Secretary