

The Claremont City Council held a meeting on Wednesday, June 13, 2012, in the Council Chambers of City Hall.

**SITE VISIT OF NEW COMMUNITY CENTER (MEET AT CITY HALL)**

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Neilsen at 5:00 p.m.

Members of the Council present were:

At-Large Councilor Keith Raymond  
Ward III Councilor Nicholas Koloski (met at the site)  
Assistant Mayor Andrew Austin  
Mayor James Neilsen, IV  
Ward II Councilor Roger Formidoni  
At-Large Councilor Thomas Burnham

Members absent were:

Ward I Councilor Victor Bergeron  
At-Large Councilor Christopher Irish  
At-Large Councilor Kyle Messier

Also present:

Guy Santagate, City Manager

Councilors travelled to the New Community Center (NCC) site.

Parks and Recreation Director Scott Hausler and Marty Horton, Hutter Construction site foreman, gave a tour of the New Community Center site.

There will be a community room which will serve as a function room and has a capacity of 125-140 people. The cardio fitness space will be 100+ feet long. The building will have a CCTV (Claremont Community Television) feed (cable will be coming into the building). Corner windows have been designed into the building. The walking track will be about 13-feet wide and will have three lanes to allow walking and jogging. There will be CAT 5 throughout the building for fitness equipment and computers. The gymnasium will be 120 feet x 98 feet and will be multi-purpose. The bleachers will be portable so they can be moved around according to need. One pool will be 8 lanes and will go from 3 feet to 12 feet deep. The second pool will go from 2 feet to 4 feet deep. It will be used for lessons and exercise. The total building will be about 52,000 square feet. The functional space including office space is about 95% of the building. Runoff from the roof will go into the water treatment under the parking lot. Per Mr. Hausler, closing of the Zotto Gym will be up to the Council.

At 6:00 p.m. Councilors returned to City Hall.

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Neilsen at 6:30 p.m. and a second roll was taken.

Members of the Council present were:

At-Large Councilor Keith Raymond  
Ward III Councilor Nicholas Koloski  
Assistant Mayor Andrew Austin  
Mayor James Neilsen, IV  
At-Large Councilor Christopher Irish  
Ward II Councilor Roger Formidoni  
At-Large Councilor Kyle Messier  
At-Large Councilor Thomas Burnham

Member absent:

Ward I Councilor Victor Bergeron

Also present were:

Guy Santagate, City Manager  
Jane Taylor, City Solicitor

## **MAYOR'S NOTES**

Mr. Irish congratulated the Stevens High School's varsity and junior varsity softball teams.

### Stevens High School Student Council Update

None

### Primex Award Presentation – City of Claremont

Tammy Denver, Claims Director and Mary Beth Purcell from Primex (City's workers comp and property liability coverage are with them) presented a claims award to the City for lowering its workers comp claims trend by 60% and P & L claims trend by 96%. The City has worked with Primex to put in a temporary alternative duty program and have mitigated claims.

Mayor Neilsen asked if the reduced claims reduce the rates. Ms. Denver said yes.

Ms. Messier congratulated City administration and department heads; this is important and quietly done.

## **REPORT OF THE SECRETARY**

**A motion was made by Mr. Koloski and seconded by Mr. Austin to accept the minutes of the May 9, 2012, City Council meeting.**

**Voice Vote: Motion carried 8-0.**

## **APPOINTMENT TO BOARDS AND COMMITTEES**

### Airport Advisory Board

**Mr. Raymond nominated David Eno for re-appointment to seat #2 and Philip (Joe) Osgood for re-appointment to seat #3 of the Airport Advisory Board. Seconded by Mr. Austin.**

**Voice Roll call vote: motion carried 8-0.**

### Claremont Community Television, Inc. (CCTV) Board of Directors

**Mr. Koloski nominated Nicholas M. Maynes for re-appointment to seat #2 of the Claremont Community Television, Inc. (CCTV) Board of Directors. Mr. Raymond seconded.**

**Voice vote: motion carried 8-0.**

### Parks and Recreation Commission

**Mr. Raymond nominated Thomas (Toby) S. Batchelder, III, for re-appointment to seat #5 – At Large of the Parks and Recreation Commission. Mr. Austin seconded.**

**Voice vote: motion carried 8-0.**

**Mr. Koloski nominated Chris Irish for appointment to seat #7 – Ward III of the Parks and Recreation Commission. Mayor Neilsen seconded.**

Mr. Raymond said this is made up of citizens not usually sitting on other boards. This board makes recommendations to the Council to vote. To have someone from the Council on the board could be considered a conflict of interest.

Mr. Koloski said he made the motion for discussion purposes. A precedent was set by allowing Mr. Irish to be on the Conservation Commission. Mr. Koloski said he is the Council rep on the Conservation Commission. At some point a decision needs to be made about how many Councilors will sit on each board. He would like to see more citizen participation.

Ms. Messier said it doesn't seem logical for the Council to appoint a Councilor to advise the Council.

Mr. Irish agreed, but the seat has been vacant for a while. This commission is responsible for a \$10 million project. He said we need to have Council representation on that commission.

Mr. Burnham asked if the board requires a Council member. Mr. Santagate said no. Mr. Burnham said he doesn't think it is appropriate to appoint a Councilor to this commission.

Mayor Nielsen said Mr. Irish is a Ward 3 resident and the seat is for Ward 3, so if Mr. Irish is not allowed to sit on this board, it could be discriminatory.

Mr. Koloski asked about Councilors on the Planning Board. Mr. Austin said there are two, one is an alternate. Mr. Santagate said that is statutory. Mr. Koloski said he doesn't agree there has to be a Councilor seat on this board.

Councilors encouraged citizens from Ward 3 to apply for the vacant Parks and Recreation Commission seat.

**Mr. Koloski rescinded his motion. Mayor Nielsen withdrew his second.**

Bernie Folta, Ward 3, said this issue is purely a political issue of the City Council.

Tax Increment Finance District Advisory Board – Downtown

**Mr. Koloski nominated Eugene J. Lattuga, Jr., for re-appointment to seat #1, Matthew Nelson for re-appointment to seat #3 and Robert H. Porter for re-appointment to seat #4 of the Tax Increment Finance District Advisory Board – Downtown. Ms. Messier seconded.**

**Voice vote: motion carried 8-0.**

Ms. Messier thanked the community members for re-applying to serve on the boards and commissions.

Mr. Formidoni said he has been asked by Dave Messier to sit on the Historic District Commission. Mayor Nielsen asked him to fill out an application.

**OLD BUSINESS**

New Community Center Update

Scott Hausler, Parks and Recreation Director, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the New Community Center progress.

- Project update
  - Steel installation near complete
  - Decking installed

Council Meeting

June 13, 2012

Page 98

- Pool contractor begins shotcrete of 1<sup>st</sup> pool
- Preparation for pouring of floors on first level
- Color scheme chosen
- Showed pictures of steel erection, water line installation, framing for shotcrete for the pool, mechanicals for the two pools, piping, pool progression, roof storm water system, soil testing, water shut-offs, compaction test, track will be 13 feet wide, 12 feet deep pool, some of the color schemes for the floors and walls, and floor plans.

There was discussion about the vapor barriers and how they are used to protect the floors.

Credit Card Update

Mary Walter, Finance Director, said we don't have a signed agreement, yet. The third party is Interware and Global Processing is the company they, and most others, use. We are trying to work out some language in the contract.

Follow-Up to Naming Rights of the New Community Center

A letter from the City Manager and the Mayor was sent to all the Councilors:

At its last meeting, the City Council asked us to review the name of the New Community Center with the objective of making recommendations to the Council. Following a meeting between us and representatives of the Claremont Saving Bank, we are submitting the following recommendations:

The name of the New Community Center must include the bank's name in its title. We suggest that the Council adopt the name as it appears in the attachment. The color scheme and the logo will continue to be discussed. Therefore, the name should appear as follows:

Claremont Savings Bank (small)  
Community (large)  
Center ○○○ (logos)  
CITY OF CLAREMONT (small)

When Claremont Savings Bank offered three million dollars as a gift, it was apparent the bank required its name to be included in the title. That requirement was included in the offer letter which was accepted by the New Community Center for Claremont, Inc. (N3C) board. Although it could be argued that the N3C board lacked the authority to make this commitment, once accepted under the terms required by the bank, the logo design is a good compromise.

In addition, we recommend no further naming rights be made for other sections of the building. Any recognition of future donations should be restricted to a plaque being placed on the memorial wall of the building.

The question of how naming rights are handled in the future could be researched further to avoid any issues.

Sherwood Moody, Claremont Savings Bank (CSB), said he met with Mr. Santagate, Mayor Neilsen and Mark Thompson, also from CSB, to discuss the name of the New Community Center. The agreed upon logo was:



Mayor Neilsen said that a Councilor had suggested adding “A Joint Venture.”

**A motion was made by Mr. Burnham and seconded by Mr. Irish to accept the logo with the words “A Joint Venture” placed where Claremont Savings Bank thinks it is proper.**

Mr. Koloski said he would vote no, however he asked to use the City logo instead of just the words “City of Claremont.”



Mr. Raymond agreed with Mr. Koloski to include the City’s logo.

Mayor Neilsen said there are two entities involved in this venture, the City and Claremont Savings Bank. The issue of the New Community Center for Claremont, Inc.’s (N3C) authority to name the facility is dead. We will honor the commitment. He doesn’t think there should be anymore naming rights, there will be a donation/memorial wall for recognition of donations. He would like to see these two commitments put into motions.

**Mr. Burnham amended his motion to use the City logo instead of just the words City of Claremont and to not use “A Joint Venture.” Mr. Irish agreed.**

Mr. Moody agreed with the change to use the City of Claremont’s logo.

Bernie Folta, Ward 3, talked about naming a facility after a business and the business doesn't continue. He said that CSB has a long history in Claremont and hopes it continues in the future.

Councilors thanked CSB for its generous donation.

Mr. Irish asked if this would be the logo on the building as well as the marketing materials. Mr. Santagate said yes.

**Roll call vote: motion carried 8-0.**

**A motion was made by Mr. Irish and seconded by Mr. Burnham to recommend no further commercial naming rights be made for other sections of the building. Any recognition of future donations should be restricted to a plaque being placed on the memorial wall of the building.**

Mr. Irish said he used the word "commercial" so that naming pieces of the NCC could be done to honor individuals. Mr. Raymond agreed.

Mayor Neilsen talked about using individual's names versus commercial names. If the motion is made using the word "commercial," he would vote no.

Mr. Irish asked if future changes will require CSB approval.

**Mr. Burnham withdrew his second; the motion should not have the word commercial in it.**

Mr. Raymond said there is a donor wall for that purpose. He has no problem voting for this as written.

Mr. Koloski agreed with Mr. Raymond, however no promises should have been made during the meeting with Mayor Neilsen, Mr. Santagate and CSB. Mayor Neilsen clarified that no promises were made, but he said that was the position he would represent.

Mr. Formidoni said we are borrowing trouble if this is left open. He agreed to the language.

**A motion was made by Ms. Messier and seconded by Mr. Austin to recommend no further naming rights be made for other sections of the building. Any recognition of future donations will be restricted to a plaque being placed on the memorial wall of the building.**

**A motion was made by Mr. Burnham and seconded by Mr. Austin to move the question.**

**Roll call vote: motion failed 5-3 with Messrs. Koloski, Irish and Neilsen voting no.**

There was discussion about the word "donation" as opposed to "memorial." Ms. Messier agreed to include "or memorials."

**A motion was made by Ms. Messier and seconded by Mr. Austin to recommend no further naming rights be made for other sections of the building. Any recognition of future donations or memorials will be restricted to a plaque being placed on the memorial wall of the building.**

Ms. Walter asked if the intent was to restrict future councils to this decision, also, can this be changed. Mayor Neilsen said they are making the decision on this facility. The intent was to protect the two entities that funded this project (Claremont Savings Bank and the City of Claremont). Because there is no process in place for naming City facilities, this could become a nightmare and he is trying to avoid that. Mr. Koloski asked if a future Council could reverse any decisions made by previous Councils. Ms. Walter asked about adding wording such as “unless it is by the decision of the Council.”

Mr. Moody supports the motion as stated. CSB’s concern was the naming of the building, and they have no opinion for rest of the building. They are fully in support of the way it is written.

Mayor Neilsen said if someone, in the future, wants to make a donation then that Council will have to deal with it.

Mr. Irish asked Mr. Hausler his opinion about naming parts of the NCC (pool, gym, etc.). Mr. Hausler talked about fundraising contributions and naming parts of the building and if this goes forward, the City will be “shooting itself in the foot” for receiving any future donations. This would make future fundraising difficult.

Mayor Neilsen said his thought process was that the only corporate entity to step forward with a donation was CSB. He feels there was ample time for any entity to make a contribution to secure a name, but no one did.

Mr. Hausler said a procedure can be put in place in the future based on the model put in place by the non-profit.

Mr. Irish said he would support ongoing fundraising (with naming rights for parts of the building) to help offset the taxes. He would like to leave this piece alone.

**A motion was made by Ms. Messier and seconded by Mr. Austin to table the motion to a date uncertain.**

**Roll call vote to table the motion carried 5-3 with Messrs. Koloski, Irish and Neilsen voting no.**

## **CITIZEN’S FORUM**

James Contois, Ward 2, said that the air pollution permit for Wheelabrator is up for renewal. He is with Working on Waste. There will be a public hearing Tuesday, June 26, 6 p.m., at the Claremont Senior Center.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### 39 Central Street Update

Police Chief Alex Scott said he went before the Historic District Commission. They are in the process of having a study done in reference to the building's historical significance. They won't take any action until that is done. Last week he spoke to the brother of the owner and he may have a lead on where to find the owner. Since his last visit with the Council on this issue, there has been only one incident since the building was boarded up.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### Discussion for Naming of City-Owned Property, Map 158-46 – Public Hearing

Mike Tetu, Ward 1, had sent a request to the Council that the former "Clark Wellhead" property be named "Karl Collise Field" (for a boy that died close to that location) and be deemed open space as of December 1, 2012.

Mr. Formidoni asked what the property is. Mr. Tetu referred to a segment he did that aired on CCTV (Claremont Community Television) and he referred to the City's GIS. He talked about the erosion of the river from 2005 to 2008 as being substantial. He described its location on Sugar River Drive at the intersection with Puckershire Avenue on the left. He calls it historically open space. Mr. Formidoni asked how big the lot is. Mr. Tetu guessed that it is 1 ½ acres and has a seasonal brook.

Mr. Austin said it is being used as the community garden site. Mr. Tetu said that is a less than fortunate choice of site for the gardeners and neighborhood. He said the neighborhood has an interest in the space being open space. The garden spots are not open to the public. He talked about the historical uses of the property.

Ms. Messier asked if the open space would preclude the community garden from continuing. Mr. Tetu said it would preclude restricting passage across that site. He said for them, the community garden was something that fell from the sky. They weren't aware of it. The garden cordons off the most usable area of the field. He would be willing to work with the community garden to find a better property. Neighbors walk in that area.

Mr. Koloski said his understanding was that Mr. Tetu opposed the community garden. Mr. Koloski acknowledged the tragic accident that occurred there. The City is going through a natural resources inventory. In the future, the Council is supposed to discuss the process for naming City-owned properties. He likes this idea, but it is putting the "cart before the horse." He is not opposed to this idea, but we need a process to do that.

Mr. Austin said the garden is already started and he doesn't want to open it up now. He has no problem renaming the property.

Mr. Burnham said there are two facilities on that property: one is an open well head and the other is a sewer pump station. The City owns it and making it open space could create restrictions. He would recommend not making it open space at this time because of those two facilities.

Mr. Irish agreed with Mr. Koloski about the natural resources inventory. His recommendation is to forward this to the Conservation Commission who is overseeing the natural resources inventory.

Ms. Messier said this property has Council approval for the community garden and this issue needs to stay unresolved until the study is done.

Mr. Raymond noted that Mr. Tetu was not trying to kick out the community garden. He thinks we should look for a better place for them next year. The river bank is being cut away. We need to look at this in the future.

Mayor Neilsen said the community garden needed to choose a spot right away. It is possible we will find a better spot.

Mr. Koloski would like to look for another spot for the community garden. He wasn't in favor of the community garden process. Mayor Neilsen agreed.

Ms. Taylor said it is approximately 4.3 acres; was acquired by the City in 1972; and is part of the water/sewer enterprise properties. It is designated for the purpose of the Sewer Department. There are very few uses compatible with sewer property.

Mr. Formidoni asked if there was a reason for the Council not to rename it as a gesture of good faith to Mr. Tetu.

Ms. Messier said there is no process to name a city-owned property. There should be a policy/procedure to establish procedures because there will be a lot of categories that will come forward.

Mr. Burnham said the property is owned by the Water/Sewer Department.

Ms. Messier said she hoped the people at the community garden and the neighbors can work together.

Mayor Neilsen said this needs to wait until the natural resources study is complete and a process is established.

Mr. Tetu said prior to the community garden, the property had always been open for day use by all. He talked about the easements. For neighbors it has been open space and he would like it to return.

Mayor Neilsen opened the public hearing.

Dave Collise (father of Carl), Ward 2, thanked the Council for its consideration. Yesterday was Carl's birthday and 4 years 6 days since he passed there. He hoped that this can happen.

Mayor Neilsen closed the public hearing.

Comments from School Superintendent

Middleton McGoodwin, Claremont School Superintendent, said his purpose was to talk about what he has been doing for the past 11 months, the school board, Council and the future. From July 2011-June 2012, he is excited and optimistic to be in Claremont. He established an entry plan: learn about Claremont; meet with residents and municipal leaders; identify the values and norms; establish targets. The outcome was presented to the school board in November. There were several findings and recommendations which helped guide him with the budget. He talked about the students' academics and challenges. He hopes to be here 6, 7, maybe 8 years to end his career here. There are challenges. Claremont is a diverse community with financial diversity as well. He talked about the state funding education and the tax burden. One thing that disappoints him is the "cloud," the perception of Claremont. He said it is wrong and he would like to be a part of the process to dissipate the unfair cloud. He talked about the fiscal dilemma which resulted in a reduction of almost \$630,000 future fiscal budget; the budget was increased less than 1%. They were looking at a shortfall of a little under \$1 million for FY13. They did strategic restructuring. In August 2011, he met with Mr. Santagate saying he wants to work with the City and the Council. In November 2011, he talked with Mr. Santagate about the entry plan and that the school board and Council are not working together. One recommendation is that the school board and Council re-establish a collaborative effort. The future of the City depends on the schools and vice versa. He asked the Council to consider the school board and Council becoming partners. The responsibilities are not identical, but the objectives are similar. It would be in the interest of communicating and working more closely together. He talked about the high school accreditation. He understands the finances, but we need to prepare for July 2013 when the state building aid process is reinstated. He would welcome the opportunity to have the Mayor and the school board chair or perhaps representatives of the Council and school board members discuss what that would look like. The schools cannot go forward as much as they could if they are connected with the City more closely.

Mr. Koloski thanked Mr. McGoodwin for coming and a joint meeting has been discussed and he hopes it can happen. Mr. McGoodwin said that he met with Mr. Santagate and Richard Seaman to start that.

Mayor Neilsen said Mr. McGoodwin told him that he is here for the betterment of the education for the children of Claremont.

Mr. Austin said that Mr. McGoodwin has changed the feeling of Claremont. He looks forward to getting together. The school hinges on how the community progresses. He believes that Council can work with the school board to make it work.

Mr. Irish compared Mr. McGoodwin's speech to Mr. Santagate's 2001 State of the City speech; they are similar.

Mr. McGoodwin said he and Mr. Santagate have the same objectives in Claremont.

Ms. Messier echoed Mr. Irish. She has seen great progress in the grade schools.

Mr. McGoodwin said working effectively with adults is important; he tries to work closely with the faculty. To be effective, they must recruit and hire the best.

Mr. Burnham made comparisons between Mr. McGoodwin and Mr. Santagate.

Steve Raymond, Ward 1, said the only way to get anywhere is for the City and schools to work together. He is glad they are working together.

Bernie Folta, Ward 3, talked about separate governance. There are 13 cities in NH; 9 with schools as a department of the city; 3 cities are separate bodies (Claremont, Keene and Lebanon); and 1 (Concord) has a legislative charter. There are various mixes of public bodies. He asked if Mr. McGoodwin should consider merging the school with the City. He said he is opposed as it would politicize the schools. He would like to see Claremont get a charter like Concord. He said he was interested in Mr. McGoodwin's opinion.

Mr. McGoodwin said with the reduction in funding that we have to ask how to do things differently. He did not come before the Council with that agenda. The questions are, is there a way to do business better and how can we make improvements. There are fiscal challenges ahead. The school board is working with energy conservation and hopes to save millions in energy savings. He can't answer Mr. Folta's question, but is interested in making changes where needed.

Mr. Santagate said this is a chance of a lifetime to work together with the schools. He visits with the civics class several times a year and is on an education committee. Education is a key to the future. When a company comes to the city, they look at the school system and a trained workforce. He looks forward to a close relationship. We want to build the City to where the kids want to stay long after graduation; have a quality of life and a healthy career path.

Mr. McGoodwin said he looks forward to that relationship.

Resolution 2012 - 13 NHDES Local Source Water Protection Grant – Public Hearing

Public Works Director Bruce Temple said this was to allow the City to apply for, accept and spend a grant to get security cameras for Dole Reservoir. This would allow us to apply for \$10,000.

**A motion was made by Mr. Formidoni and seconded by Mr. Austin to adopt Resolution 2012 - 13 NHDES Local Source Water Protection Grant.**

Mr. Formidoni read the resolution into the record.

Mayor Neilsen opened the public hearing. No one spoke. He closed it.

**Roll call vote: motion carried 8-0.**

Resolution 2012 - 14 Authorize Expenditure of 4 NH Emergency Management Grants – Public Hearing

Fire Chief Rick Bergeron said this was a follow-up on the four emergency management grants that have been discussed over the last several months. They are:

- Purchase and installation of a generator for an emergency shelter to be located at the City's new Community Center in the amount of \$140,108.00;
- Purchase of Command Vehicle Enhancement Equipment in the amount of \$14,107.00;
- Purchase of 40 narrow band compliant Minitor V Radio Pagers Grant in the amount of \$13,247.00; and
- Phase 1 of the development of an Emergency Operations Center (EOC) in the amount of \$27,184.00; and

**A motion was made by Mr. Raymond and seconded by Mr. Irish to adopt Resolution 2012 - 14 Authorize Expenditure of 4 NH Emergency Management Grants**

Mr. Raymond read the resolution into the record.

Ms. Messier congratulated Chief Bergeron on getting the grants. Chief Bergeron said the two larger ones were made easier by the Council approving construction of the New Community Center.

Mayor Neilsen opened the public hearing. No one spoke. He closed it.

**Roll call vote: motion carried 8-0.**

Ordinance 527 Adopt Fire Code Administrative Rules – First Reading

The purpose of this proposed change is to adopt the Claremont Fire Department's Sprinkler & Fire Alarm Rules and Regulations, as required by the State Fire Code.

Enactment of this Ordinance will update the Claremont City Code and bring it into compliance with state law and regulation.

Chief Bergeron said this is an extension of the state fire codes. These rules and regulations have been in use for half a dozen years. He talked about resetting pull stations and because of this, the keys that are used will be standard.

**A motion was made by Mr. Raymond and seconded by Mr. Irish to adopt Ordinance 527 Adopt Fire Code Administrative Rules on first reading.**

Mr. Raymond read the ordinance into the record.

Mr. Koloski asked about emergency sprinkler head activation and the requirement to have a permit to reset it. Chief Bergeron said the intent was to apply if changing/moving heads. If there is a major upgrade, they have to comply with current codes.

**Roll call vote: motion carried 8-0.**

Chief Bergeron showed a PowerPoint presentation about a life safety code change that affects five properties within the community.

- Sprinklers in Existing Places of Assembly. A Brief Historical Perspective
- NH Law Mandates the Enforcement of NFPA 101 – “The Life Safety Code”
  - NFPA 101 – 2003 Edition – Did not require sprinkler systems in existing ‘Places of Assembly’ occupancies
  - NFPA 101 – 2006 Edition – Did require sprinkler systems in certain existing ‘Places of Assembly’ occupancies
  - NFPA 101 – 2009 Edition – Continued the requirement of sprinkler protection in certain existing ‘Place of Assembly’
- Which Circumstances Trigger Sprinkler Protection
  - Code Language States: Where the occupant load exceeds 100, the following assembly occupancies shall be protected throughout by an approved, supervised automatic sprinkler system in accordance with 9.7.1.1(1):
    - (1) Bars with live entertainment
    - (2) Dance halls
    - (3) Discotheques
    - (4) Nightclubs
    - (5) Assembly occupancies with festival seating
- Events that Have Led to this Mandate
  - Coconut Grove Fire – Boston, MA, Nov. 28, 1942 – 492 Deaths

- Ringling Brothers and Barnum & Bailey Tent Fire Hartford, Conn., July 6, 1944 – 168 Deaths
- The Beverly Hills Supper Club Fire, Southgate, KY, May 28, 1977 – 165 Deaths
- Happy Land Social Club – Bronx, NY, March 25, 1990 – 87 Deaths
- The Station Nightclub – West Warwick, RI, Feb. 20, 2003 – 100 Deaths
- Code Reactions to the 2003 Station Nightclub Fire
  - Three weeks after the Station Nightclub fire the NFPA convened an emergency meeting in Boston
  - As a result of this meeting, the National Fire Protection Association adopted Tentative Interim Amendments (TIAs) to deal with this problem
  - The TIAs were adopted on August 14, 2003, and gave all governing entities the option to adopt these amendments
  - These TIAs formally became part of the Life Safety Code when the 2006 Edition was adopted
  - The State of Rhode Island formally adopted the 2003 Edition of the Life Safety Code with amendments on February 20, 2004, the one year anniversary of the Station Nightclub fire
  - The State of New Hampshire did not adopt the amendments or the 2006 Edition of the Life Safety Code, but has now adopted the 2009 Edition of the Code

Chief Bergeron said his department will notify the five Claremont entities that this applies to and they will have to come up with a corrective action plan to comply with the Code. They try to have compliance within a 3-year period.

Mr. Raymond said it was good to know that they have a 3-year window to get this done.

Motion to Accept Highway Safety Audit and Apply for Highway Safety Grant

Police Chief Alex Scott said Rusty Fowler and other citizens brought their concerns to the Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC) and the City Council relative to some of the intersections on Washington Street. With the help of the Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission (UVLSRPC), we were able to get a grant to do a highway safety audit. The resulting report was accepted by the TAC. By the Council accepting the report, it will allow the City to apply for future grants. He credited Mr. Fowler with pushing this forward. We are hoping that the first safety improvement grant we can go after will address some of the issues at the Bowen Street intersection, which is the most accident-prone intersection on Washington Street.

**A motion was made by Mr. Austin and seconded by Mr. Raymond that whereas the City of Claremont has received a Road Safety Audit Report of New Hampshire Route 11 (Washington Street) from Dane Avenue to Winter Street from the Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission (UVLSRPC) in conjunction with the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT); and whereas, the Report identifies certain safety issues and makes suggestions for related corrective actions; the Claremont City Council hereby accepts the Road Safety Audit Report and also authorizes the City**

**Manager, or his designees, to undertake all such actions as may be necessary to apply for and, if awarded, accept a NHDOT Highway Safety Grant for implementation of certain infrastructure improvements along the Washington St. corridor.**

Mr. Koloski said the report has valid points. Chief Scott said it opens the opportunity for additional grants and provides a road map to address how we can improve the issues on Washington Street.

Mayor Neilsen said at Monday's Planning Board meeting there was a plan that was before them and there was a discussion about making right-turn only exits. There are challenges to go across several lanes of traffic to make a left turn exit. He said the policy of the Planning Board going forward, with the plan reviews on Washington Street, is to try to continue to enforce right-turn only exits. Chief Scott said this document will provide the Planning Board with back-up for those types of suggestions.

Rusty Fowler, Ward 3, apologized to Chief Scott and the Traffic Advisory Committee because he accused them of doing nothing. He applauded them for going after the grant. In the future, he asked to be kept updated to what is going on. He looks forward to some changes on Washington Street.

**Roll call vote: motion carried 8-0.**

Motion to Accept \$52,000 Grant from Public Utilities Commission for Wood Pellet Boiler in the Fire Station

Chief Bergeron noted that it was just coincidence that the sprinkler requirements for City businesses and changes to the sprinkler rules and regulations came up tonight.

Chief Bergeron gave a brief history of how this grant came about. He applied for a grant to install a pellet boiler at the fire station. They were looking for a carbon neutral or zero emissions alternate energy. The goal is to get 90-95% of their heat from wood pellets. Cornish Elementary School is heated by wood pellets. They are carbon neutral. The state gets energy credit for installing these systems. The system that is planned in the Fire Department would avoid 52.36 tons of emissions. He hopes to save \$4,000 /year on fuel.

**A motion was made by Mr. Koloski and seconded by Mr. Austin that whereas the City of Claremont has received notice from the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (the "PUC") of the award of a grant from the Renewable Energy Fund for the purchase and installation of a biomass pellet boiler for the Claremont Fire Station, the Claremont City Council hereby authorizes acceptance of the PUC Renewable Energy Fund Grant in the amount of \$52,000.00 and further authorizes the City Manager or his designees to execute all documents and undertake all actions as may be required for the acceptance of this grant.**

Rusty fowler, Ward 3, said he installed a wood pellet stove 3 ½ years ago and it has saved him 1,200 gallons of fuel oil a year, cutting his consumption by 2/3.

**Roll call vote: motion carried 8-0.**

Tax Deeded Properties Update

Ms. Walter showed a PowerPoint presentation about Tax Deeding.

- Tax Deeding
  - What choices do we have
- Real Estate Billing Process
  - We follow the rules and regulations set forth and governed by the state of NH. In compliance with the NH state laws, our billing year (RSA 76:2) starts on April 1 to March 31 of the following year
  - We send out real estate bills semi-annually (RSA 76:15-a)
- Delinquent Taxes
  - Start accruing 12% interest (RSA 76:13) on the unpaid balance the day after the due date. For example, the first real estate bill is due July 1. If not paid, it will start accruing interest on July 2, until the day the first bill is paid in full. The final bill is due on December 1. If not paid, it will start accruing interest on December 2, until the day it is paid in full.
  - If you receive a delinquent notice from the Tax Office, it means we have not received payment. Within ninety days of the due date of the final tax bill, the tax collector sends a notice including all unpaid taxes to the property owner. This is known as the notice of arrearage (RSA 76:11-b)
- Tax Liens
  - Process begins after the due date on the Notice of Arrearage
    - Notice of Impending Lien, (RSA 80:60) is sent to the last known owner of the property via certified mail, return receipt requested. This notice includes principal, interest and costs up to the date of the lien. The cost of the certified mailing is also added to the delinquent account.
    - Lien is placed on property if not paid (all principal, interest and costs are combined to form the principal amount of the lien and the cost of the execution of the lien (RSA 80:81) is added to the total amount due). Interest jumps to 18% interest (RSA 80:69) on the unpaid balance until the lien is paid in full. The lien is recorded at the Registry of Deeds and a title search is done. A Certified letter is sent to each lien holder notifying him or her of the lien. An administrative cost (RSA 80:67) of \$10.00 as well as any additional expenses incurred as a result of the title search are added to the cost of notifying mortgagees. Taxpayers should also be aware that if the City places a lien on their property, it becomes part of their credit report and remains there for seven years after the lien is discharged.
    - When full payment of a lien is made, the Release Of Lien will automatically be sent within thirty days to the Sullivan County Register Of

Deeds, for example, if the lien is paid in full on March 14th, the Lien Release will be sent to the Sullivan County Register Of Deeds by April 21st, located at 14 Main Street, Newport NH (603) 863-2110

- Tax Deeding
  - In statute: RSA Chapter 80
    - Claremont uses the optional tax lien procedure set forth in RSA 80:58-:91 when we lien property.
    - Those who have filed for protection under the federal Bankruptcy Code follow a different process.
    - The Notice & Tax Lien process is followed each year property taxes are delinquent.
    - Two years after the execution of a tax lien, if taxes remain unpaid, the Tax Collector begins the process (RSA 80:76) by which the property may be deeded to the City of Claremont.
    - At least 30 days prior to the deeding, a title search is completed and a notice of impending deed (RSA 80:77) is sent to the current owner and all mortgagees (RSA 80:77-a) recorded at the Registry of Deeds for Sullivan County.
    - Pursuant to RSA 80:76, the governing body must determine whether or not to accept the deed offered by the collector. The tax collector *has a statutory duty to offer the deed*, but the governing body may refuse to accept the deed under certain circumstances.
- What is the Governing Body's Role
  - If the collector's deed is refused, the tax lien remains in place indefinitely, retains its "super priority" over all other liens *and interest, costs and penalties continue to accrue*. The landowner continues to have the right to "redeem" the property after paying all of the sums due. If the reason for not accepting the deed is later resolved, the governing body may instruct the collector to issue the deed after notice is provided to the property owner and mortgage holders.
- What Happens If We Accept It
  - If the "collector's deed" is accepted by the governing body at the end of the process, title to the land passes to the municipality. At this point, it becomes public property, and the landowner has limited legal right to require the municipality to convey it back. Pursuant to RSA 80:89, if the former owners pay all of the back taxes and penalties within three years of the date the tax deed is recorded, they may recover ownership subject to all of the encumbrances that were there at the time the property was taken.
  - *However*, the municipality can offer the property for sale within that three years once it gives 90 days notice to the former owner describing the terms of the offering and the right of the former owner to repurchase the property.
  - Once the property is deeded, the owner, as well as anyone holding a mortgage, loses all interest in the property. To reclaim that interest (RSA 80:89), the owner or any mortgagee must notify the City of Claremont within three years after the deeding, pay all back taxes (including those which would have accrued had you continued to own the property), all costs assumed by the City of Claremont and a

penalty of 15% of the equalized assessed value within 15 days of your notice of intent to repurchase.

- Why Would We Not Accept It
  - Pursuant to RSA 80:76, II, the municipality does not have to accept a contaminated property, or II-a, undesirable obligations or liability risks
  - The municipality is authorized to enter the property to assess its condition (RSA 80-19-a)
- Are There Examples of Other Reasons
  - Mobile home where the land under it is owned by someone else
  - The home may have hazardous materials present (asbestos or toxic mold)
  - An undeveloped parcel of land has been clear cut and has minimal value for development
  - The taxes are unpaid because the owner has died, there is no family and it is run down
  - The property consists of a building in poor condition, with several small rental units and building code problems
  - Condominium – ongoing monthly fees
- Is That Good
  - It allows us to lease or encumber all or any portion of the property, without any accountability to former owners. Proceeds of sale must be accounted per RSA 80:88
  - If the property is improved and persons reside there, the residents become tenants of the municipality
  - Repairs, upgrades and maintenance are ongoing
- We Don't Want to be a Landlord – Are There Other Options
  - Yes, the property can be offered for sale to make it productive again
- Any Continuing Obligations to the Former Owners
  - If the municipality holds onto it, the former owner can repurchase it for up to three years from the date of recording of the tax deed
  - However, the municipality can offer the property for sale within that three years once it gives 90 days notice to the former owner
  - Within 30 days of that notice, the former owner can pay all back taxes, interests, costs and the penalty imposed by RSA 80:90 (penalty is 15% of the assessed value as of the date of the tax deed)
- Continuing Obligations to the Former Owners
  - If the former owner is unable or unwilling to redeem the property following this notice, the property may be sold (sealed bid process) using the standard provided in RSA 80:80.
  - If the proceeds realized are greater than the amount needed to pay the back taxes, interest, costs and penalty, any additional funds must be paid to the former owners.
  - If there are liens or other encumbrances, the funds must be deposited with the Superior Court and the court will determine distribution to the claimants
- In Summary – the Governing Body Can:
  - Accept the collector's deed, or

- Not accept the collector's deed because either:
  - It would subject the municipality to undesirable obligations or liability risks. RSA 80:76 II or,
  - Ownership of the real estate would involve "undesirable obligations or liability risks" or "for any other reason [that] would be contrary to the public interest." RSA 80:76 II-a
- What happens if we don't accept the tax deed
  - The property is usually 3 years behind in payments before it gets to this point PLUS they usually have two additional years they haven't paid. Even though it's now at 18% interest, 18% of no payment is still no payment.
  - Each year we set the tax rate based on the budget passed. Because the property tax is the major method of revenue for the city, if you get three years behind in your payments the City still had that debt to pay for and now may had to borrow to fund the lack of tax receipts due to unpaid property taxes.
  - That unpaid debt is considered an uncollectible against your fund balance. The more you accumulate in unpaid property tax payments means that everyone else in the community is subsidizing those property owners because you are now borrowing money because they haven't paid.
  - That is why some communities (like Berlin) tax deed them and begin the tax sale proceedings within the 90 days (they feel that people have three years from the time of the bill to make payments, etc.)
- For Next Month's Meeting
  - Staff will bring forward those properties that are scheduled for tax deeding along with recommendations on those with known environmental or other potential liabilities for Council to act upon

Ms. Walter said for people who want to stay in their home, she didn't see a method to do a payment arrangement before being tax deeded.

#### Fiscal Year Conversion

Ms. Walter showed a PowerPoint presentation about Changing to a Fiscal Year.

- Changing to a Fiscal Year, RSA 31:94-a
- Objective Tonight
  - To have a discussion about changing the City's accounting period from a calendar year (January to December) to a fiscal year (July to June)
- Objective
  - Council has been requesting we change to a fiscal year for some time but funding it was an issue and the ability to pay with a "5<sup>th</sup>" quarterly bill was only available by legislation in Concord
  - This funding option was approved in 2004
  - Even though approved, the municipality needed to ensure that it could fund the extra months with that 5<sup>th</sup> quarterly bill
- Current Status: Calendar Year
  - Budget prepared and approved in Nov-Dec of prior year

## Council Meeting

June 13, 2012

Page 114

- Accounting and spending begins January 1<sup>st</sup> of current year
- Tax bills to pay for current year sent out in June and December
- Advantages
  - Everyone is used to it
- Disadvantages
  - School, county and state are on a July to June fiscal year. Any downshifting from the state budget leaves us less than 6 months to react since we are already halfway through our budget
  - We often borrow money short-term to pay bills or delay payment of bills until receipt of tax money in June and December
  - Often have large outstanding property taxes that are still open as of the end of the “60-day” rule increasing GASB liabilities
  - Taxpayers get 2 large bills each year and many end up overwhelmed and in tax lien
- In Summary:
  - We are spending for 6 months before we receive tax payments
- Proposed Change to a Fiscal Year (If Approved)
  - Annual budget prepared in January-March of current year. Council would receive it 60 days prior to July 1 (early May)
  - Budget approved by end of May of the current year or City Manager proposal goes into effect
  - Fiscal year spending begins July 1<sup>st</sup>
  - Timing and or amount of tax bills would change
- Proposed transition to a fiscal year
  - Advantages:
    - City on same accounting year as school, state and county
    - Lessens need for potential borrowing costs
    - Improved efficiency in finance department
    - No longer in arrears on our spending requirements
    - Money on hand before spending begins. (No living off reserves)
  - Disadvantages:
    - Method of budgeting and billing of taxes must be changed.
    - Changes what we know and understand; may cause confusion in the short term
  - In summary
    - We recommend changing to a Fiscal accounting year for the long term advantages as outlined. This will ensure continued sound financial management benefits.
- 4 Options to Convert to a Fiscal Year
  - *The Just Do It Method*: This method funds the entire 18-month transition budget through taxation. It will result in a one-time increase of approximately 50 percent in the municipal portion of the tax rate.
  - *The Save Ahead Method*: RSA 35:1-a authorizes the establishment of a capital reserve fund to set aside money in anticipation of the change to the optional fiscal year. Utilizing this funding method, a municipality would appropriate money into

the reserve fund for use at a future date when the 18-month transition budget is adopted. For example, if a municipality typically raises \$15,000,000 to fund annual town operations, then the anticipated 18-month transition budget would be approximately \$22,500,000 (\$7,500,000 to fund the additional 6-month period). A municipality could plan to appropriate \$2,000,000 each year for four years into a capital reserve fund. At the end of the four-year period, there would be \$8,000,000 plus any interest in the reserve fund to offset the transition year budget and take into effect some inflation. The result would lessen the impact on the tax rate during the transition year since the tax rate impact was spread over the previous four years when the reserve was funded. (But that's still over \$2.50 per \$1,000 on the tax rate for the next 4 years!)

- *The Bonding Method:* RSA 31:94-d authorizes the issuance of bonds to fund the transition budget. Such bonds are limited to one-third of all taxes assessed and must be repaid within 20 years.
- *The Quarterly Billing Method:* Started by the City of Concord, this method entails issuing five quarterly bills during the 18-month transition period. There is a 12-month budget, funded by four quarterly bills, and then a separate 6-month budget funded by the fifth quarterly bill. The formula for this method relies on the fact that one-quarter of all taxes assessed (municipal, school and county) provides an amount sufficient to fund 6-months of the municipal budget. After implementation, the city continues with quarterly billing, still issuing bills twice a year: two bills in June, which are due July 1 and October 1, and two bills in December, which are due January 2 and March 31.
- Options to convert to a fiscal year
  - For many people, the quarterly billing method seems to defy logic. How can five quarterly bills issued in one year not result in double taxation? It doesn't, but that's not necessarily the easiest thing to explain to taxpayers, or to a judge in Concord's case.
  - But the quarterly billing method did in fact withstand court scrutiny, and in 2004, the provisions of Concord's special legislation were placed into general law under RSA 76:15-aa, available for implementation by any municipality.
- Summary of Funding Options for Conversion
  - Bonding
    - Advantage: Can spread out expense up to 20 years
    - Disadvantage: Creates an additional payment on the tax rate for the next 20 years.
  - Fund Balance (if you have enough in there)
    - Advantage: Stabilizes tax rate first year
    - Disadvantage: DRA must approve minimum balance of reserve funds, must replenish reserve in subsequent years. It will require another source of funding along with the use of the fund balance.
  - Taxes
    - Two Options
      - 1. Added onto the Tax Rate
      - 2. Quarterly Billing

Council Meeting

June 13, 2012

Page 116

- Funding Options for Conversion
  - Taxes – Option 1 – move to a fiscal year but continue with semi-annual billing
    - Fiscal year with continued semi-annual billing in June and December would require a “one-time” increase of \$1,350 on a property assessed at \$150,000 dollars.
      - Advantages are continuation of a system we know and are comfortable with. There are no incremental increases in operating costs for this option.
      - Disadvantages are that one-time increase and the perception it will be a permanent increase. Plus it still doesn’t help with the huge bills homeowners receive twice a year.
  - Taxes – Option 2 – move to a fiscal year and quarterly billing using the 5<sup>th</sup> quarter
    - 6 month budget paid with 1-time “5<sup>th</sup> Quarter” payment. Quarterly taxes due date thereafter in January, April, July, and October of each year.
      - Advantages are no one-time tax increase in the rate. Bills are not so overwhelming when received.
      - Disadvantages are the change to quarterly tax bills which may cause confusion for taxpayers, banks, realtors etc. in the short term.
    - One time increased operating costs for required software changes to our computer system. Estimated at \$2,000.
- Annual Tax Payments – Option 1

	Apr. 1	July. 1	Oct. 1	Dec. 31	Total
<b>2013 Fiscal Year - semi annual</b>					
<i>(Based upon a home assessed \$150,000</i>		2489		3575	6064
<i>a one time tax increase of \$1086 would occur.</i>					
<i>\$90.00 per month.)</i>					
2014 Fiscal Year - semi annual		2489		2489	4978
<b>2015 Fiscal Year - semi annual</b>		2489		2489	4978
<i>Above Amounts in Subsequent Year Assume No Increase In Tax Rate</i>					
<i>Still send and collect twice a year</i>					

- 
- Annual Tax Payments – Option 2

Due Dates	Apr 1	July 1	Oct 1	Jan 2	Mar 31	Total
2013 with 5 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	1086	1086	1086	1086	1086	5430
<i>(with no tax rate increase)</i>						
2014 Fiscal Year - Quarterly Payments		1086	1086	1086	1,088	4346
2015 Fiscal Year - Quarterly Payments		1086	1086	1086	1,088	4346
Above Amounts Assume No Increase In Tax Rate on Home Assessed at \$150,000.						
<i>Calendar Year Calculations</i>	<i>Apr 1</i>	<i>July 1</i>	<i>Oct 1</i>	<i>Jan 2</i>	<i>Mar 31</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Payments made during 2013</i>	<i>1086</i>	<i>1086</i>	<i>1086</i>	<i>1086</i>		<i>4346</i>
<i>Payments made during 2014</i>		<i>1086</i>	<i>1086</i>	<i>1086</i>	<i>1086</i>	<i>4346</i>

- 
- Other benefits
  - Billing quarterly seen as more manageable by citizens
  - Improved financial cash flow
  - Work distributed more evenly throughout the year
- In summary
  - We recommend proceeding with a change to quarterly billing and conversion to a fiscal year with the 2013 budget. We will need an ordinance to proceed with the change and will need to update the code at the same time.
  - If council wants to proceed we will draft an ordinance to be ready for the July and August meeting and, if approved, it means we will be presenting an 18-month budget in the fall.

Mr. Santagate said the taxpayers get an extra bill that will fund conversion. Ms. Walter said every city except Lebanon and Claremont has moved to fiscal year.

Mayor Neilsen said the 5<sup>th</sup> bill will cause havoc on escrow analysis.

Ms. Walter said notifications will be made to the banks and credit unions. She can find out how others have done it.

Ms. Messier would like to know which towns did which procedures and what the pros and cons were.

Mr. Irish said he is in favor of the quarterly billing and being able to use a credit card.

Bernie Folta, Ward 3, wondered what the other cities in NH have done. He wondered why the law has not changed to allow quarterly or monthly billing under calendar year accounting. He

said it sounds like the 5<sup>th</sup> quarterly payment will have to pay for 6 months. He thinks that is too large a change to be done in two months. We need to have a plan.

Mr. Koloski said he is not interested in proceeding with this at this time. It would hit citizens hard. Mr. Austin agreed with Mr. Koloski as we are in a bad economy. Ms. Walter said the key is when we are able to fund the 6 months; previously we were not able to fund the 6 months with the one-quarter of the billing. This year we could and it probably has to do with the layoffs we have had. She is not sure, going forward, that we would be able to do it unless another method such as bonding was used.

Mr. Burnham asked for public input.

Ms. Walter said this is for information. We can afford to do this for the 2013 budget, but it is unknown if we can do it for future budgets because of health insurance and retirement rates (next year retirement rate increase is expected to be 24%).

Mr. Irish talked about himself and others not being current on taxes and he asked how to be able to get, and stay, current. He said quarterly billing will help everyone.

Mr. Koloski talked about people that are struggling and that it wouldn't change regardless of the number of payments.

Mayor Neilsen questioned whether escrow companies would be able to make quarterly payments. He said this needs more discussion.

Mr. Burnham said an 18-month budget is going to save money along the line. We have to do this. He asked if Ms. Walter can run a zero-increase 18-month budget. Ms. Walter said there is not a lot of discretionary spending (i.e. paving). She said there are a lot of variables that have to be looked at.

Council agreed this discussion should be continued next month.

Resolution 2012 – 15 \$42,594.64 Department of Safety Grant for Police Radios – Public Hearing

Chief Scott said this is to update portable radios to replace radios that are past their shelf life. This will allow us to purchase 11 new radios (dual band, UHF, VHF). It will allow us to be able to communicate with Vermont law enforcement.

**A motion was made by Mr. Koloski and seconded by Mr. Austin to adopt Resolution 2012 – 15 \$42,594.64 Department of Safety Grant for Police Radios.**

Mr. Koloski read the resolution into the record.

Mayor Neilsen opened the public hearing. No one spoke. He closed it.

**Roll call vote: motion carried 8-0.**

2012 Police Department Awards and Police Memorial Week Review

Chief Scott said he will bring this back in August.

Motion to Accept OHRV Enforcement Grant

Police Chief Alex Scott asked Council to suspend its Rules to allow a motion to accept an OHRV (Off Highway Recreational Vehicle) Enforcement Grant. It requires Council approval for the City Manager to sign the documents. The grant window is a short timeframe.

**A motion was made by Mr. Koloski and seconded by Mr. Raymond to suspend the Rules to allow discussion of the motion to accept an OHRV Wheeled Vehicle Enforcement Grant.**

**Voice vote: motion carried 8-0.**

**A motion was made by Mr. Raymond and seconded by Ms. Messier to authorize the City Manager, or his designees, to enter into an agreement with and accept an OHRV Wheeled Vehicle Enforcement Grant in the amount of two thousand, seven hundred dollars (\$2,700.00) from the State of New Hampshire Fish and Game Department for the purpose of enforcing laws related to OHRV Wheeled Vehicles by the Claremont Police Department.**

**Roll call vote: motion carried 8-0.**

Chief Scott said the on-site CALEA assessment has been set for July 23-25. He will update the Council on this in July. A public hearing will be set for input.

**CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

None

**FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND DIRECTIVES**

Mr. Irish asked to have on the next month's agenda, the proposed change to Council Rule 34. He mentioned the meeting with the school board. He asked to get the procedure for naming city-owned property.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Claremont 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Committee

None

Claremont City Center Project – Steering Committee Report

None

**NON-PUBLIC SESSION PURSUANT TO RSA 91-A:3,II(a) – PERSONNEL**

**A motion was made by Mr. Koloski and seconded by Mr. Austin to go into Non-Public Session Pursuant to RSA 91-A:3,II(a) – Personnel and to invite Ms. Taylor, Chief Scott, Ms. Walter, Mr. Santagate and Dorée Russell, Clerk to the Council.**

**Roll call vote: motion carried 8-0.**

**A motion was made by Mr. Koloski and seconded by Mr. Austin to seal the minutes until after the personnel issues have been resolved.**

**Roll call vote: motion carried 8-0.**

**A motion was made by Mr. Koloski and seconded by Mr. Burnham to exit the non-public session.**

**Roll call vote: motion carried 8-0.**

**CONSULTATION WITH LEGAL COUNSEL**

None

**ADJOURNMENT**

**At 12:24 a.m., a motion was made by Mr. Koloski and seconded by Mr. Formidoni to adjourn.**

**Voice vote: motion carried 8-0.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Dorée M. Russell  
Clerk to the Council