

Regular Meeting of the
Hillsborough County Board of Commissioners
January 14, 2011
Bouchard Building, Goffstown, NH
Minutes of the Public and Non-Public Session
(Not Official Until Approved by the Board and signed by the Clerk.)

Present: Comm. S. Ziehm, Comm. C. Holden, Comm. M. Pappas, R. Burns, P. Coughlin, J. Hardy, D. Hogan, Rep. D. Robbins Rep. C. Seidel, C. Kirby, B. Moorehead, J. O'Mara, D. Reidy, M. Rioux, E. Robinson, M. Castonguay, G. Wenger, and L. Stonner.

Also Present: S. Maranto, Jr.

1. Pledge to the Flag

Comm. Ziehm called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m., followed by the Pledge to the Flag led by Comm. Holden.

2. Administrative Business

Commissioner Ziehm noted that the Board would address administrative business at this time and entertained a motion to approve the meeting minutes.

Minutes

December 29, 2010 Board of Commissioner's Meeting

Motion: To approve the minutes of the Hillsborough County Board of Commissioners held on December 29, 2010. By Comm. Holden, second by Comm. Pappas. Motion carried.

January 5, 2011 Board of Commissioner's Meeting

Motion: To approve the minutes of the Hillsborough County Board of Commissioners held on January 5, 2011. By Comm. Pappas, second by Comm. Holden. Motion carried.

Approval of Payroll Register

Motion: To approve the Payroll Register dated December 28, 2010 in the amount of \$400.00, and the Payroll Register dated January 6, 2011 in the amount of \$1,079.91, and the Payroll Register dated January 6, 2011 in the amount of \$1,234,153.51, subject to review and audit. By Comm. Pappas, second by Comm. Holden. Motion carried.

Approval of Accounts Payable Registers

Motion: To approve the Accounts Payable Register dated January 11, 2011 in the amount of \$4,586,554.89, subject to review and audit. Motion by Comm. Holden, second by Comm. Pappas. Motion carried

Motion: To approve the Accounts Payable Register dated January 12, 2011 in the amount of \$657,712.56, subject to review and audit. Motion by Comm. Holden, second by Comm. Pappas. Motion carried

Extradition Vouchers

Motion: To approve adoption of the Extradition Vouchers, noting that they have been approved by the County Attorney on the following dates:

➤ 10/19/2011	\$ 21.00
➤ 10/21/2010	354.04
➤ 12/15 to 12/16/2010	786.58
➤ 12/19 to 12/21/2010	1,791.96
➤ 12/19 to 12/21/2010	1,786.90
➤ 12/19 to 12/21/2010	1,851.55

For a total of : \$ 6,592.03

Motion by Comm. Holden, second by Comm. Pappas. Motion carried.

Mr. Wenger explained that the process for approving Extraditions that are before the Board for review at this meeting; he noted that the County Attorney authorizes the Sheriff to go out on the extradition; the bills are submitted and the County Attorney signs off on them and, lastly, the Board reviews and approves the detail and expenses associated with each voucher. In response to a question from Comm. Ziehm, Mr. Wenger explained that the expense is not related to transferring a prisoner for a court appearance; it is when the Sheriff's Office goes out to pick up a fugitive from justice who is being held in another community. He explained the process of transferring a high profile prisoner, noting that it is handled by an approved internal transfer that is requested by the DOC. Comm. Holden noted that the Commissioners have an opportunity at the end of the meeting to review the Extradition expense and detail.

Motion approved.

3. Public Comment on Agenda Items

There was no one from the Public present who wished to speak to Agenda items.

4. Department of Corrections

Census

Supt. O'Mara presented the DOC Census, noting that as of January 11, 2011, the Census was 577, which included 507 men of whom 364 were being held pre-trial and 143 that have been sentenced. There were 70 women of whom 49 were being held pre-trial and 21 that have been sentenced. There were 16 in the community.

Mr. O'Mara referred to a previous discussion regarding granting the Superintendent the authority to receive prisoners for the month of January; he noted that House Bill 115, which has recently been filed, is intended to amend the statute to authorize County Superintendents to accept and receive inmates from other jurisdictions. He explained that there is a hearing scheduled for the following Thursday relative to this; it is House Bill 115. Mr. O' Mara suggested that an appropriate policy would be to follow the Board's recent action, which allowed the DOC to accept inmates with the understanding that the Board will be notified at its next regular meeting and the Board can address any concerns at that time. Mr. O' Mara explained that he is confident that he understands the Board's parameters and noted that the DOC would not accept prisoners who have serious medical issues.

Mr. O' Mara informed the Board that he will present the annual Women Prisoner Housing Agreement with Rockingham County at a subsequent meeting. Comm. Holden noted that Hillsborough County follows the RSA relating to accepting or transferring inmates from/to other Counties.

Mr. O' Mara informed the Board that the previous Tuesday, the NH Senate heard the Senate Bill that relates to repealing the Evergreen law. He noted that he believes that it will be sent to the House; it is on the "fast track" and may be heard the following week.

5. Nursing Home

Census

Mr. Moorehead presented the Nursing Home Census and explained that as of January 6, 2011, the census for the Nursing Home was 278 total patients/residents, which included 199 Medicaid residents, 47 self pay residents, and 30 Medicare Part A residents.

Mr. Moorehead indicated that the total Census as of today is 241, the Medicare mix is up with 34 Medicare residents.

Mr. Moorehead referred the Board to the Year to Date Revenue (for budget year 2011). He explained that the numbers are through December and noted budgeted revenue is \$12,749,178 and the actual is \$12,044,080, which results in a negative variance of \$705,098. He explained that there is a lag time for some of the information and income to be received; there are at least 2 Stimulus payments that the Nursing Home should receive; it has only received one to date and expects a second this month. Additionally, he explained that the budget includes \$1,000,000 in the ProShare funds income that do not come in until June.

Comm. Holden asked Mr. Moorehead to update the Board relative to the Nursing Home Paperless Project. Mr. Moorehead explained that they are in the process of preparing the bid specifications for the hardware and it will be going out soon; the wiring and walk-through has been done.

Mr. Moorehead updated the Board regarding the flu epidemic at the Nursing Home. He noted that the flu is now isolated in 1 unit; there are 2 or 3 current cases; CDC is aware of the situation and lab results are pending. In response to a question from Comm. Ziehm, Mr. Moorehead noted that CDC is involved whenever any large group of residents become ill and reporting continues until the flu/illness has subsided. He explained that they do not physically come in, but are involved remotely and will set guidelines relative to admittance, transfers from room to room, hand-washing and required lab work.

Revenue Update – Registry of Deeds

P. Coughlin, Register of Deeds distributed information relative to Registry Revenue for year to date; it provided the Board with a Revenue Update for the period of July through December, 2010. She noted that the Registry is a little below 2009. She explained that during January, February, July and August of 2009, the Registry did very well. Ms. Coughlin noted that she remains optimistic that the Registry will meet its goals at the end of the current fiscal year.

Bid # CA 2011-01

County Attorney D. Hogan presented Bid # CA 2011-01; he explained that this bid is for the online research that is done by the County Attorney's staff. He recommended LexisNexis as the preferred research provider at a cost of \$20,208 further noting that this is a three-year contract and LexisNexis is the current vendor. Attorney Hogan noted that this is not a new line item and explained that as long as there have been law firms, there has likely been an expense for research. He noted that in the past, the research was done by books, but now all research is done online as opposed to spending \$13,000 on

books each year. He suggested that the overall expense has been reduced with the use of computer research.

Attorney Hogan informed the Board that the County Attorney's office has many paper records that it saves and that the records occupy a great deal of space. He noted that to put all the records on computer would consolidate all the information and save a great deal of space, which in turn will save money.

Attorney Hogan noted that LexisNexis is the least expensive bidder for the bid before the Board today. He noted that another vendor submitted 2 bids. Discussion ensued regarding the bidding process.

Motion: To approve Bid # CA 2011-01 for the online research that is done by the County Attorney's staff to LexisNexis, Philadelphia, PA, as the lowest bidder at a cost of \$20,208, noting that it is the current vendor and that it is a three-year contract with fixed annual pricing. Motion by Comm. Pappas, second by Comm. Holden.

Comm. Holden inquired of Attorney Hogan, asking about a program affiliated with Microsoft that offers to add LexisNexis to Microsoft Office at no extra cost. Attorney Hogan indicated that he was not aware of this, but noted that he will look into it. Discussion ensued relative to the bid's deadline; Comm. Holden noted that the offer is good until January 21st. M. Rioux explained that when the County Attorney's researched the bid, Westlaw spoke to them about the type of platform that Comm. Holden mentioned. She explained that it is a program that would interface with Microsoft Office to use it as a search engine for the office files. This would allow a person to access information that was already researched by another person in the office. She explained that it appears to allow a better search through a Department's files, but does not include the online research that Attorney Hogan is requesting. Following discussion, the Board agreed that it was prepared to move the motion.

Motion carried

6. Old/New Business

Community Block Development Grant – City of Manchester

Mr. Wenger introduced Sam Maranto from the City of Manchester who is here to address the Board regarding the Application to NH Community Development Finance Authority (CDFA) for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding. Mr. Maranto thanked the Board for allowing him to address it on behalf of the City of Manchester.

Mr. Maranto explained that the City acquired a four-story brick building the previous year that was built in 1908. He noted that it is located in a neighborhood where the City has been improving infrastructure and housing and explained that the City's position is that it was a building worth acquiring and preserving, and the plan is to use the building as a multi-service facility for various service organizations. Mr. Maranto explained that there were unanticipated additional expenses involved in the initial cost; the City has spent 1.1 million dollars and needs another anticipated 1 million to finish the renovations. He informed the Board that because the building is considered an historic building, there were requirements that had to be met including installing a sprinkler system and an elevator.

Mr. Maranto explained that the Manchester Community Resource Center is a service organization that provides skilled building job training to Manchester residents; it would like to move into the building and act as the major tenant and expand their services to include other job training programs for unemployed youth focusing on a large and growing immigrant population in Manchester and throughout the County. He explained that that other interested service organizations include Big Brother & Big Sisters, New African Americans, and up to half a dozen non-profit organizations that would share a centralized intake

process to try to get some economy of scale. He informed the Board that the fourth floor has a space of about 4,000 square feet; it was used previously by the Odd Fellows for their functions; the plans is to leave the space open; it will provide a good space for community functions and public hearings.

Mr. Maranto explained that Phase I will be complete next month; the City does not want to leave it empty once the first stage has been completed. The City would like to move forward with Phase II. Mr. Maranto informed the Board that the Mayor approached the State for available funding and explained that the City is requesting that the County act as the applicant for consideration of a \$500,000 grant of Community Development Grant (CDBG) Funds from the New Hampshire Community Development Finance Authority. He explained that this application does not preclude other County communities from applying for funds.

Mr. Maranto informed those present that CDBG Funds are allocated to CDFA through the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development and are earmarked to benefit low and moderate income residents possessing incomes no greater than 80% of the area median; there is also money for economic development. He noted that there are 2 times each year when applications can be made for CDBG funds- January 1st and July 1st. Mr. Maranto explained that the City would like to get this application in by January 31st and noted that the County could not apply for this type of housing again for one year, but it could apply for a different type, or another community could apply directly.

He noted that the funds require 1 to 1 matches, which in this case, the requirement has already been met. He explained that to meet the January deadline, an application would have to be filed with CDFA. Mr. Maranto noted that there is a challenge in putting this application together; it relates to completing all of the various regulatory requirements by the 31st of this month, the last date of submission. Requirements include:

1. Commissioners approving the application process.
2. Public Participation Meeting (with a notice in the paper by January 17th)
3. Post Public Hearing (to be held 10 or more days after the notice is posted)
4. Other regulatory requirements:
 - An approved County Housing and Community Development Plan
 - A County Residential Anti-Displacement and Relocation Plan adopted by the Commissioners

Mr. Maranto explained that he will work with the Board to meet the requirements, and noted that the City will put the plans together.

Mr. Maranto summarized by saying that the City of Manchester considers this a worthwhile project and hopes that the Board will approve the request for application.

Comm. Pappas informed the Board that she and Mr. Wenger had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Maranto and Mayor Gatsas recently and noted that she was very impressed with the presentation by Mayor Gatsas. She explained that one of the items he spoke about was the overlap of non-profit or not-for-profit organizations, all of whom are frequently doing the same thing; this would bring everyone together under one roof providing services that people need for the City of Manchester as well as Hillsborough County; it is a model that the whole State could be looking at. She indicated that it is her belief that this is a great way for Hillsborough County to do something for its citizens, and she supports it 100%.

Comm. Holden noted that she has several questions and noted that she went past the building and is concerned about parking in that area. Mr. Maranto indicated that there is parking across the street in an area that is a former basketball court and playground. In response to a concern from Comm. Holden regarding the regulatory requirements; Mr. Maranto indicated that he would work with the Board to prepare the Housing and Community Development Plan and a Residential Anti-Displacement and Relocation Plan. Comm. Holden expressed her concern that there is no remuneration for the County in

the proposal, and noted that in other grants, there is an administrative fee for the administrative work that is done by the County. She noted that this plan states that the County will not have any costs; however, she has concerns about that because the County is responsible and has a liability, particularly if the County has not done the plans or approved them in a proper process. She also noted a concern that this comes in at the last minute, further noting that she is concerned about any involuntary relocation, which can be costly. She indicated that while Mr. Maranto indicated that there is no impact on the County, there is an impact; the County does not have this money in the Contingency line at this time; it will mean that during the next budget cycle the request for funding will have to go through the budget process, which means that the Commissioners, the Executive Committee, and the Delegation will have to approve the \$500,000 for Contingency. She noted that there is no way the Board can guarantee that this will be approved at all levels during the budget cycle. She indicated that even though it may not affect taxes, the County will still have to raise and appropriate that \$500,000 for the Contingency line, and there is no guarantee that the County will get the full amount back because there will be some County costs.

Comm. Pappas indicated that it is her understanding that the County will receive funds for the administrative costs. Mr. Maranto responded that the grant allows 10% for costs; he indicated that it is common for a community that does not have a grant writer on staff to hire a professional grant writer or consultant to manage the project. He noted that the City of Manchester will provide his services to administer the grant for the County; any other costs would be remunerated so there would be no costs to the County for this project. Mr. Maranto noted that in terms of the housing plan, it would indicate that the County would strive to look at properties that were vacant that did not require relocation. Further discussion ensued relative to housing and HUD requirements.

Mr. Wenger noted that when speaking to the City of Manchester, it was made clear that the County does not have funds at the present time, and if this were to be pursued, it would be with the understanding that the Commissioners would be making the commitment to request the \$500,000 for this project in their FY 2012 budget, subject to the approvals of the Executive Committee and Delegation, and if that money did not get approved at any point, the County could not move forward with this grant opportunity. He noted that it is his belief that the City is aware of the risk with this proposal. Mr. Wenger noted that discussion was held regarding the reporting requirements, which is one of his concerns, and the City is offering its experience and services to assist with the grant; he noted that it could be a learning curve similar to that of the Rockingham Planning Commission that he spoke of previously.

Comm. Ziehm explained that she had a concern about the City learning of the grant from the Governor; Mr. Maranto responded that the information came through the Governor's office, which in turn referred the City to NH Housing & Community Development Finance Authority. She addressed a concern that related to using the money that was allocated to the five Towns, and that now the City wants a second share. She noted that it seemed to her that those who make the distribution of funds were trying to make sure that the smaller Towns had an opportunity to get money, and that it would not all go to the bigger cities. She noted that she questions whether it is the County's responsibility to get money for the cities. Mr. Maranto added that because the City of Manchester has such a significant system of social services, Manchester becomes a clearinghouse for people who come from the entire State to access its services; he explained that the City of Manchester has a significant population of new immigrants; inherent with that comes additional responsibilities for the City and the County.

Mr. Maranto explained that rather than having many different centers, the City's plan is to have a centralized center that will serve several service agencies. He noted that funding will not be approved unless the City cannot show a significant impact to the County. Comm. Pappas informed the Board that the Manchester Community Resource Center serves folks throughout the County, not just Manchester.

Comm. Ziehm mentioned that she spoke with Mayor Lozeau who was not aware that there was money available. She explained that she finds the proposal confusing; she indicated that on one side, there is

someone saying, "This is how the money will be distributed," and other the other side it seems that there is someone trying to circumvent the system that was set up to distribute the money. She expressed her belief that if the money is not used it will go back to the Federal Government; she noted that this is a good thing because the country has such a big deficit. Mr. Maranto explained that the City is not trying to circumvent any kind of system; the County has, by virtue of the State law, the authority to apply for these funds and he is trying to demonstrate that this is for a facility that will benefit the entire community. He further explained that the money will not go back to the Federal Government; it will be utilized, but may not be for the citizens of Hillsborough County if the application for these funds is not made. He noted that this program has been in effect for 25 years and many Counties have applied for funding over the years for mobile home cooperatives, day care centers, and senior centers, but for whatever reasons, Hillsborough County has not applied for those funds. He expressed his belief that it would be a benefit to the County to apply for the funds.

Comm. Ziehm noted that she has concerns about the short time frame and the expectation that the County should move very quickly on this request; she expressed her belief that she is opposed to that and believes that she should not be put under pressure, but should have time to do research and move clearly relative to any decisions she makes, especially when such a large sum of money is involved, and when our State and Nation is in such peril financially; she also has concerns that everyone interested in this funding should have a fair shot at this. Comm. Ziehm explained that based on the aforementioned concerns, she will not be able to support this request. Mr. Maranto reiterated that the funding has been available since 1974, and he is not sure why some are not aware of it, but the State, by law, is required every year to publish legal notices in all media and communities.

Comm. Ziehm expounded further about the distribution and her original thought process. Mr. Maranto noted that this is an application and emphasized that there is a 400-point scoring system that must be met; all the points must be addressed for any entity that will be receiving these funds. He explained that it is not simply a matter of putting in an application and receiving the money; he noted that he will need to demonstrate, on behalf of the City, that this is a worthy project. Mr. Maranto suggested that if approval is not given at this time, he would appreciate the Board's consideration of the request prior to the July 1st deadline.

Comm. Ziehm asked the Board how it would like to proceed.

Motion: To approve the grant application for the City of Manchester. Motion by Comm. Pappas. Motion failed for lack of a second.

Board Organization

Comm. Ziehm noted that the Board could review the committee appointments at this time. Mr. Wenger provided a list of committees that he believes need to have a Commissioner appointed to; they include:

- UNH Cooperative Extension Advisory Board

Comm. Holden is interested in continuing to serve on the UNH Cooperative Extension Advisory Board, and the Board agreed that she should do so.

- NHAC Certification Board

Comm. Clemons had served on this Board in the past. Supt. O'Mara informed the Board that it is optional for County Corrections Officers to serve on this Board and noted that the other nine Counties send their Superintendents; he noted that it is option for the Board to elect a Commissioner to serve or it can appoint him to serve in their stead, but historically, Hillsborough County has sent a Commissioner.

Motion: To elect Supt. O'Mara to serve on the NHAC Certification Board. Motion by Comm. Pappas, second by Comm. Holden.

Comm. Ziehm indicated that as a new Commissioner, she would like to attend as many boards and meetings as possible so that she can learn what happens at each; she indicated that she would like to go to these meetings as well. Supt. O'Mara asked Comm. Ziehm if she would like him to accompany her; she responded in the affirmative. Following discussion, the Board agreed to appoint Comm. Ziehm and affirmed that Supt. O'Mara will accompany her.

A formal vote was not taken.

NHAC Executive Committee

Comm. Ziehm noted that Commissioners Holden and Clemons have served in the past and inquired if Comm. Holden would like to continue in that role. Comm. Holden explained that 2 Commissioners could be appointed and noted that Comm. Pappas is considered to be on the Committee as Past President of the Association. The Board agreed that Comm. Ziehm would replace Comm. Clemons and Comm. Holden would continue to serve.

Comm. Ziehm inquired if the appointments should be formalized with a motion being made by the Board. Comm. Holden responded that it would be good practice to have formal motions and have the record show that the Board did deliberate and that the decisions were made by the majority of the Board.

Comm. Ziehm entertained motions relative to the appointments.

Motion: To appoint Comm. Holden to serve on the UNH Cooperative Extension Advisory Board. Motion by Comm. Pappas, second by Comm. Holden. Motion carried.

Comm. Ziehm asked if the Board would like to move to fill the positions on the NHAC Executive Committee. Following discussion, Mr. Wenger affirmed that the members who recently served were:

- E. A. Robinson
- B. Moorehead
- Comm. Holden
- Comm. Clemons
- Mr. Wenger

Mr. Wenger noted that it is not necessary to nominate Comm. Pappas because she automatically serves by virtue of being immediate Past President. The remaining 5 positions will require new nominations.

Motion: Comm. Pappas moved that Comm. Ziehm, Comm. Holden, E. Robinson, Mr. Moorehead, and Mr. Wenger be appointed to the NHAC Executive Committee. Motion by Comm. Pappas, second by Comm. Holden. Motion carried.

Comm. Ziehm inquired if the Board wished to make a formal motion to appoint someone to the NHAC Certification Board. Mr. Wenger asked Supt. O'Mara if the person appointed is authorized to vote on behalf of the County; Supt. O'Mara responded in the affirmative.

Motion: To elect Comm. Ziehm to serve on the NHAC Certification Board. Motion by Comm. Pappas, second by Comm. Holden. Motion carried.

Comm. Ziehm noted that Comm. Holden has served on the State/County Finance Committee and asked if she wished to continue in that role. Comm. Holden responded that she would like to continue in that role and noted that Comm. Pappas can attend by virtue of her past office.

Motion: To nominate Comm. Holden to serve on the State/County Finance Committee. Motion by Comm. Pappas, second by Comm. Ziehm. Motion carried.

Comm. Ziehm inquired if the Board wished to appoint a Commissioner to the NHAC Legislative Committee. Comm. Holden noted that there are multiple members on the Committee and that the business of the Committee is usually done by conference calls. Comm Holden further stated that the work of the Committee involves testifying on bills at the State House. Mr. Wenger noted that it is his understanding that this was a technical committee in the past. Following discussion, the Board agreed that it was not necessary to make a nomination.

Comm. Ziehm noted that another position to address relates to Emergency Management. Comm. Holden noted that Pandemic Planning was not considered, but she does not feel it is necessary to appoint a Commissioner to that position, noting that it has not met in one and one-half years. Following discussion, the Board unanimously agreed that the Chair is automatically the Emergency Management representative for the County. Comm. Pappas offered to nominate Comm. Ziehm; Mr. Wenger explained that it defaults to the Chair if no one else is appointed. Mr. Wenger read the relative statute and noted that the Sheriff historically keeps the Board apprised of any Emergency Management issues. The Board did not feel it was necessary to make a motion, and agreed to let the position default to the Chair.

Comm. Ziehm asked for clarification regarding whether the law considers that a quorum of the Board has been reached if 2 or more of the Commissioners show up for a meeting. Mr. Wenger explained that Comm. Ziehm is correct in her assumption that this could be an issue.

Mr. Wenger advised that he would notify the NHAC of the appointments made at this meeting.

Comm. Ziehm explained that she has items that she wished to address. She asked about parameters regarding to Board communication. She noted that she would like to have Business Cards but suggested that the Board use up the letterhead that is on hand. Mr. Wenger asked the Board if it wished to change the format of the letterhead. Discussion ensued relating to price and how the letterhead is used; consideration was given to removing the Commissioner's titles; and the situations where the Board is required to communicate by letter. Mr. Wenger explained that much of the inter-office communication is done electronically to keep the cost at a minimum.

Comm. Ziehm inquired about the appropriate use of email. Mr. Wenger noted that with a 3 person Board, any communication between 2 or more of the Board members is subject to the provisions of RSA 91-A; he explained that in the past, email to all Board members is used for procedural items such as scheduling or re-scheduling the Board meetings; he observed that he prefers to proceed in the same manner as long as the Board is comfortable with that; there won't be email communication between Board members. Comm. Holden noted that but virtue of the statute, any email communication between Board members is considered to be part of the public record.

Comm. Ziehm noted that Telephone Polls were on the list of items to discuss. Mr. Wenger explained that the Board no longer uses Telephone Polls for Board approval of requests; an example would be a request from the DOC and a subsequent motion to transfer an inmate. He noted that it is his understanding that the Board will not do Telephone Polls. He further noted that the Board may wish to consider at this meeting extending the Superintendent's authorization for accepting prisoners for the month of February or until the bill is finalized.

Comm. Ziehm asked for clarification related to establishing \$1 positions. Mr. Wenger explained that during the budget process, \$1 positions are created, primarily at the DOC and the Nursing Home. Mr. Wenger explained that in order to create or hold a position in Hillsborough County, it has to be approved by the Board of Commissioners and the Executive Committee; through the budget process, there are a number of \$1 positions included in the budget; this give departments the flexibility to fill a position yet the cost of that position does not have to be appropriated. He explained that an example of that would be when Mr. Moorehead has a position that he needs to fill but only has a \$1 position; in the past a Telephone Poll was conducted to give Mr. Moorehead the authority to fill that \$1 position.

Mr. Wenger noted that more recently, the practice has been to authorize Department Heads to fill a \$1 position subject to bringing it to the Board at its next meeting to confirm approval. Discussion ensued; Mr. Wenger explained the frequency of this practice in more detail. He noted that while it is not often necessary to fill the \$1 positions, it is a way to give the Departments flexibility to meet their needs during the year, but not have to appropriate all the money; it helps keep the budget down. The Board concurred that it is a good procedure.

Relations with the Press

Mr. Wenger and the Board discussed appropriate ways of dealing with the press. The consensus was that each person would/could answer any questions in an honest and straightforward manner; however, it was important to point out to the press that when one Commissioner is speaking, it is only the personal opinion of that Commissioner. The Board also agreed that it would be wise to inform Mr. Wenger of any press contacts so that he could keep the Board informed of any issues. Mr. Wenger noted that there is a difference between an individual speaking and the Board speaking; he explained that by statute, the Commissioners make up a Board, and the Board can only act by majority vote of the Board.

Appropriation Control Reports

Mr. Wenger asked the Board what financial reports the Commissioners would like to see from the Business Office and from other Departments; he informed the Board that an Appropriation Control Report can be printed at any time; he explained that he has a current copy; it shows what has been spent with respect to the budget.

Comm. Ziehm explained that as a new Commissioner, in order to be prepared, she would like a review with the Departments prior to the budget process. Mr. Wenger noted that he would like to have a discussion of the budget process and suggested that the Board may wish to ask the Department Heads to meet with the Board to provide an overview of their budgets prior to them submitting their budgets. He asked the Board if there were certain information beyond what has traditionally been provided that it would like to see. Comm. Ziehm offered that once she has had an opportunity to review the Department's budgets, she should have more of an idea of what she wants. She noted that there are also new Representatives who will not be familiar with the budget process who may wish to attend the preliminary meetings and she would like for them to have the opportunity to attend as well.

M. Castonguay remarked that there is a Delegation organizational meeting for the Representatives to begin working on the budgets; each Department comes in and provides an overview; it is usually done immediately after an Executive Committee meeting; it is open to the entire Delegation. Mrs. Castonguay explained that the purpose is twofold; it is to familiarize the new Representatives with the process, and to get them interested and encourage them to volunteer for a subcommittee.

Comm. Ziehm explained that she, personally does not want to wait until the end of March and indicated that she feels that the budget process will be a daunting task and it is her goal to understand what she is voting for; she noted that if the Board will be holding preliminary meetings, she would like to extend an

invitation to the Representatives; they don't have to come, but at least they would have an opportunity to know what is happening. Comm. Ziehm shared her concerns and feelings regarding the budget process. She announced that she is going to be very conservative; she explained that she believes our State and our Nation are in trouble, thus she will be looking at things. She noted that she wants to understand what authority she has to approve spending money and where that money comes from. She communicated her wish to know what statutes apply so that she is always in compliance.

The Board discussed sending a welcome letter to the new Representatives; there was agreement to send such a letter; Mr. Wenger will draft a letter for the Board's approval.

Comm. Ziehm asked for a list of all the Representative's mailing and email addresses. M. Castonguay will provide that information.

Board's Meeting Schedule

Comm. Ziehm noted that upon reflection of Comm. Pappas' suggestion that the Board might consider meeting every three weeks, she would like to see the meetings occur more frequently for awhile. She also noted that she has not aware yet of the workload for a County Commissioner and expounded on her reasons for meeting more frequently. Mr. Wenger offered that the Board averages approximately 38 regular formal meetings a year. Comm. Holden indicated that she advocates for meeting every 2 weeks because of addressing Accounts Payable and Payroll. She explained that these are approved at each meeting and that the Board has met on the off week from Payroll. She raised the possibility of meeting at 9:00 a.m. during the good weather months, perhaps beginning in April; this would make it possible for the Board meetings to end earlier. Comm. Ziehm offered that she could do 9:00 a.m. meetings; Comm. Pappas explained that she too could do that; in fact she would be able to meet earlier. The consensus was that beginning in April, the meetings would start at 9:00 a.m.

Comm. Ziehm raised the subject of transfers, noting that the Executive Committee has discussed addressing them quarterly. Comm. Pappas requested that the Board be able to hear input from the Department Heads before addressing the issue. Supt. O'Mara indicated that he has no problem dealing with transfers quarterly but noted that this could be a challenge for the Departments and noted that they need some lead time to put a quarterly routine into practice because the Departments are accustomed to going month-to-month in presenting transfers to the Board and to the Executive Committee and they have a routine of forecasting only 30 to 60 days ahead. He suggested that if the Board were to address transfers quarterly, the Departments would need at least a quarter to be able to analyze their spending habits and prepare transfers for the Board meetings. He noted that addressing transfers quarterly could work except for emergencies.

Comm. Ziehm asked if starting in April would be possible; Supt. O'Mara responded in the affirmative. Sheriff Hardy agreed that this could be possible, except for emergencies, but noted that his Department would need some lead time. Ms. Robinson agreed that her Department could probably work on a quarterly system; however, it would be important to realize that transfers are frequently done in June and July in order to close out the fiscal year with all the budget lines having the appropriate balances, and none of the lines having a negative balance. She noted that this is her only concern regarding quarterly transfers.

Mr. Wenger asked Supt. O'Mara how this would work for him; he responded that his Department, for example, is allowed to take unexpended funds from Salaries & Wages line when the Overtime budget line is over-expended. He explained that in this situation the funds would be transferred from the Salaries & Wages line to the Overtime line; this action would not change the total budget for his Department. He noted that the DOC cannot predict vacancies but it can try to predict and control usage. Mr. Wenger asked if it would work for the transfers to be addressed in September, December, March and June; Supt.

O'Mara responded that he could do that but added that there may be some in July. Mr. Wenger noted that while the County can strive to address transfers in those months, it will be necessary to be somewhat flexible at year-end.

Mrs. Castonquay indicated that she believes that what Rep. Kurk was referring to was possibly not holding meetings in the summer months or perhaps not in January or February if there was no business to conduct. Comm. Ziehm explained that it was very clear to her that Rep. Kurk felt that the meetings were expensive and that anytime they could consolidate or reduce meetings, they would be saving the County money. Comm. Ziehm suggested that if the Board favored this action, perhaps Mr. Wenger could put together some sort of schedule for the State Reps so they could have an idea how this will coordinate with their schedules. Mr. Wenger noted that he will follow the Board's direction.

Comm. Pappas informed those present that she will be in Washington, DC for the date of what could be the March 9th meeting if the Board continues with the same two-week schedule it has been following because she, along with Betsy Miller, President Eileen Bolander and Commissioner Ray Burton are meeting with the four members of New Hampshire's Congressional Delegation in Washington DC on that date. Comm. Holden stated that she would be available for a meeting on March 9th meeting. Following discussion, the Board agreed to move that meeting to Thursday, March 10 at 10:00 a.m. Mr. Wenger asked if the Board had decided to continue holding its meetings on the alternating Wednesdays. There was a general agreement that the Board would continue the same schedule, with the exception of the March 10th meeting.

Mr. Wenger requested that the Departments become more formalized with respect to putting agendas together; the Business Office will be striving to have the Agenda put together on Thursday prior to the meeting so that it can get the packets assembled and get them to the Commissioners on Friday. Comm. Ziehm acknowledged that this it was her request to have the packets prior to the meeting.

Special Board Meetings

Mr. Wenger noted that this item refers an earlier discussion where 2 or more Commissioners show up at a meeting. He noted that when 2 or more of the Commissioners are gathered together for the purpose of County business, it would be considered a meeting and it will have to be posted and there will have to be minutes taken. He noted that the primary issue the Board faces is related to when Commissioners attend the Executive Committee meetings. He explained that the recent past practice has been for the Delegation Coordinator to add a clause on Executive Committee Agendas that the Board of Commissioners are invited to the meeting; when two or more Board members attend that meeting; the minutes are presented to the Board for them for adoption and they then become part of the Board's minutes and the Board is complying with the hurdles of the statutory requirements.

Comm. Ziehm inquired about where meeting agendas are posted; Mr. Wenger informed her that it is posted on the Bouchard Building, in Nashua at the Registry of Deeds, and in the past it has been posted at the County Attorney's office; he noted that when the Court returns to Chestnut Street in Manchester, it is likely that the agenda will again be posted at the County Attorney's office. He noted that while it is not part of the statutory requirements, he believes it is also posted in the Departments.

There was further discussion regarding Special meetings, and who has historically attended the meetings. Comm. Holden noted that when the Commissioners have attended Executive Committee meetings, they have not "talked business." She noted that the Commissioners can answer a question, if asked, but they don't confer with one another. Comm. Ziehm asked about the Executive Committee schedule; Mr. Wenger noted that it usually announced at this meeting. He noted that it is his understanding that it typically meets the 4th Friday of each month at 9:00 a.m. with some exceptions such as near Thanksgiving and Christmas. M. Castonquay added that the meetings are more frequent during the budget process; she

noted that the July meeting may be different. Mr. Wenger explained that the July date relates to the Business Office's ability to process the transfers and close the fiscal year. Further discussion ensued.

Personnel Policies & Procedures

A discussion of Policies took place. Mr. Wenger noted that by statute, any expenditure over \$5,000 has to go out to bid and be approved by the Board; prior Board practice was to approve expenditures of over \$1,000 and there has been some discussion about what limit the Board wishes to set that would require Board approval of bids, i.e. at \$1,000 or \$5,000. Comm. Holden noted that this is another issue where she would like to have input from the Departments. She noted that Supt. O'Mara still provides the Board with a copy of what he has put out to bid that is under \$5,000. She explained that as long as the Departments are abiding by the RSA's, the County is protected; however, the Board does not know that. Mr. Wenger explained that the initial message from the Board to the Departments when it raised the approval amount was that any bids over \$1,000 would not have to come before the Board for approval, but the Departments should continue to follow competitive bidding practices and should have documentation to support the requirements should a question be raised. Comm. Ziehm asked about today's bid where one company bid twice; Mr. Wenger explained that the particular company submitted bids for 2 different products. In response to a question from Comm. Ziehm, Mr. Wenger responded that RSA 28-A is the statute that relates to competitive bidding. Comm. Holden noted that Hillsborough County's bidding statute is more extensive than other Counties. Further discussion ensued relating to bidding regulations.

Mileage Rate

Mr. Wenger explained that the Board currently follows the Federal Mileage Rate, which is 51 cents per mile.

Copy Fee

Mr. Wenger explained that the copy fee has been 25 cents per page as long as he has been here; he asked the Board if it wished to continue that. There was discussion about usage and other entities where the rate may be higher. Attorney Kirby provided information relative to copy fees; she explained that the cost has to be related to the actual cost of reproducing the documents; she noted that the County cannot attach a fee over and above the actual; she cautioned the Board about arbitrarily changing the amount unless there is justification for doing so. Following discussion, there was a general agreement to leave the cost at 25 cents. Mr. Wenger explained that the copying volume in his office is not usually significant.

Bouchard Building

Mr. Wenger explained that it has been the County's past practice to only allow County Departments to use the Bouchard Building facility; he asked if the Board wished to continue the same practice, or if it wished to consider allowing outside agencies to use the building. Comm. Holden suggested that since there is now a Court in the building and the Sheriff has additional responsibility for security, the practice should remain the same. Following discussion, the Board agreed to leave the practice as it has been in the past.

Budget process

Comm. Ziehm asked for discussion relative to the budget process. Comm. Holden noted that she has a past budget instruction book with her. Mr. Wenger noted that in 2006, the Commissioners submitted their budget instructions in a book; then the Board met with each of the Departments for a discussion regarding where they were, what was happening, and what they were forecasting for their upcoming budget; he

noted that this provided the Board the opportunity to discuss each budget. He explained that the Departments then submitted their budgets; the Commissioners then met with the Departments and went over the budgets line by line. Mr. Wenger suggested that because of the change on the Board and the learning experience, a process of that nature may be appropriate and one that the Board may wish to follow. He observed that the Board could consider whether it wished to meet with the Departments prior to or after the Board provides budget instructions. He explained that subsequent to 2006, the Board had one large meeting where all the Departments met together with the Board; the Commissioners went around the table and heard from each Department. Mr. Wenger observed that the reasoning behind that approach was so that all Departments would have an understanding of the issues that faced the other Departments.

Comm. Ziehm noted that she, personally, would prefer individual meetings initially, and then bring the Departments together. Supt. O'Mara noted that he would be happy to meet with Comm. Ziehm individually, and he offered that it is likely that the other Department Heads would be willing to do the same. She responded that this made sense to her and the other Commissioners would not have to sit through the meetings for things that they already know.

Mr. Wenger noted that there is a great deal that is unknown about the upcoming budget process, and there are often rumors or expectations about what the Board is doing. He suggested that it is worthwhile for the Board to review the budget, have an opportunity to talk, and have a frank discussion regarding what it is expecting in the coming fiscal year's budget. He observed that the more the Board meets and talks, the clearer the Board will be regarding its expectations and better the Departments will understand the Board's expectations for the coming budget. He noted that he does respect the fact that it is a demand of the other Commissioners time, but he is looking to get some direction so that the County is not dealing with issues at the last minute.

Comm. Ziehm suggested that perhaps the other Commissioners could share their goals, and noted that she would share hers. She expressed her belief that because the State is in financial trouble, her perspective is that she agrees with the Governor's message, namely, that we all need to sacrifice; we all need to be part of the solution for our children's sake. She observed that she would like to see the Board look at the budget with an eye to cutting it, perhaps 4% to 5%. She asked the other Commissioners if they wished to speak.

Comm. Pappas noted that at this point in time, it is her belief that the budget that the Board presented last year was a good budget and her goals would be to sit down with each Department to receive input from the Department regarding what its needs are and what they might be able to cut; she explained that she would like to hear from each of the Departments before she makes a statement that she would like to see a budget cut of a certain percent.

Comm. Holden noted that her goals, which have not changed, would be to inspire effective, efficient public service, to improve productivity, to effectively utilize the tools available to us (such as technology), to work effectively with staff and other elected and appointed officials, and to exchange ideas. She indicated that she does not have "her scissors with her today," and she does not have a figure in mind regarding what to cut, but she would like to realistically see what the County can do for the taxpayers. She noted that while people may suggest a 4% or 5% cut, it is her belief that it depends on the Department and whether it is staffed 24/7.

Comm. Pappas added that it is possible that the County can bring in more revenue. Comm. Ziehm noted that she was not criticizing anything that has been done but suggested that difficult times require difficult decisions; she explained that this was her reasoning and would like the Delegation to know that "we are a team, and we are on the same page with them; we understand that our State is in trouble. We understand

that the taxpayers are stressed with the burdens we are placing on them.” She explained that she is very proud to be a part of this organization and the job that it is doing.

Comm. Holden remarked that it has been her experience that the Board of Commissioners has always worked together; she noted that they have worked on budgets and have had their differences regarding spending, but the goal is to do the best job for the County. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Wenger expressed his appreciation for the discussion that was just held and summarized his understanding, based on discussion, that the Board will continue to proceed on with bi-weekly meetings, he will begin to develop the budget process by continuing the large group meetings of all the Departments; and at this point, Comm. Ziehm will make arrangements to meet with all the Departments at which time she will have a budget discussion.

Women’s Prison Lease

Mr. Wenger informed the Board that the lease for the Women’s Prison expires on June 30, 2012; it can be extended by mutual agreement so the Board will need to give consideration to how it will address this issue, and if it wishes to continue the lease.

Comm. Ziehm conveyed her belief that, regarding land and Comm. Pappas’ comment regarding revenue, she is not happy to see the building in front of the Bouchard Building empty; she noted that as a realtor, if she owned that building she would like to see the building occupied; it is valuable commercial space. She indicated that she has already called a friend who is a large commercial broker to learn about the demand for space in Goffstown because she is not as familiar with the demand for space here as she is in Nashua. Further discussion ensued; Comm. Ziehm asked her fellow Commissioners if they objected to her getting an opinion of the aforementioned building. Comm. Holden noted that it is necessary to go out to bid regarding the leasing or use of space in County buildings. She noted that she will provide Comm. Ziehm with the list of property that was available to be developed. Comm. Ziehm explained that she is interested in the marketability of the space, and of the square foot cost versus that cost in Nashua.

Comm. Ziehm asked the other Commissioners if they had given thought to comments at the previous meeting relative to the Commissioners making some kind of concession; she noted that she is open to listening to any ideas that the other Commissioners might have; she expressed her opinion that because the Delegation made a concession, she would like to see the Board do the same in the spirit of saying to them that we appreciate what they did and we would like to work with them.

Comm. Pappas noted that she had given Comm. Ziehm’s request consideration and noted that each Commissioner has a travel line and her thought is that perhaps each Commissioner could take a small amount of money from her travel line and donate it to an organization that the County funds, specifically, Meals on Wheels.

Comm. Holden noted that she is in a different position regarding travel; her District has 25 Towns that she has to visit from Litchfield all the way to Peterborough and from Deering all the way to Mason and New Ipswich so she has not come to a conclusion. She noted that she is willing to discuss it but she does not have a proposal at this time. Discussion ensued regarding the Board’s willingness to work together. Comm. Ziehm observed that she has no doubt that the earlier grant request for the building in Manchester is a worthwhile project, but noted that she feels that “we have to stop somewhere, we have to stop spending, we have to discipline ourselves and live within our means, and in her opinion, that is not being done.” Comm. Ziehm elaborated on her thinking regarding cutting spending.

Comm. Pappas addressed the earlier grant discussion and explained that grant approval would not have cost the County any money whatsoever, and it “is actually a cost savings to the City of Manchester to

bring everything together in one central location, so this is a grant that would save money as well as help our citizens throughout the County.” Comm. Ziehm responded, “I understand that, but we are a whole; the Federal dollars are our dollars; money is not free; that money comes from us; we pay that in our taxes to the Federal Government and somebody has to stop.” Comm. Ziehm further expressed her beliefs regarding concessions, cutting costs and working with the Delegation.

Mr. Wenger informed the Board that there are union grievances that need to be scheduled. He explained how they are typically address grievances and noted that he will try to schedule grievances within a Board meeting. The Board agreed.

Mr. Wenger noted that there is an issue relative to arbitration and authority to sign for arbitration. Attorney Kirby was recognized and advised the Board that under collective bargaining agreements between the County and various unions, there is a provision consistent with RSA 273-A pertinent to a grievance procedure; the grievance procedures in the County’s agreements provide that the union can request arbitration within a particular timeframe. She added that within the last month or so, PELRB has developed a new form; the new form requires management to sign off on the appointment of an arbitrator. She noted that the County has never had to do that in the past, and in the future, the County may indeed object to the appointment of an arbitrator if the union is untimely or if the County does not believe the issue is one that has been properly grieved. She informed the Board that at this point there are two pending cases, one involving the Chemical Workers and one involving AFSCME # 2715; the union has requested the appointment of an arbitrator; and they have asked the County to sign off on it. She explained that she handles the arbitrations but she is unclear who has the authority to sign off on it. She asked the Board if she has the authority to sign off on grievances that are subject to the arbitration provision of the collective bargaining agreement, at least until the PLRB modifies the form.

Motion: To grant such authority. By Comm. Holden, second by Comm. Pappas. Motion carried.

Mr. Wenger informed the Board that Community Connections has requested an opportunity to meet with the Board and discuss the status of the project, the successes, and where it would like to go. He explained that Community Connections facilitated the expansion of the Mental Health Courts with a grant, the funds of which are going through the Department of Corrections budget. He indicated that Susan Stearns from Nashua Mental Health would like to come to a meeting to provide information and asked if he could set it up for the Board’s next meeting. The Board agreed to the request.

Comm. Ziehm referred back to the schedule and asked if it would be for the year. Mr. Wenger responded that it could be for 6 months or the full year with the caveat that it is subject to change by the Board. Comm. Ziehm noted that she would prefer it to be for a year. Mr. Wenger agreed to develop the schedule and distribute it to the Departments.

Comm. Holden asked about the press release for the Dental Discount program and asked if it had been distributed. Mr. Wenger offered to distribute it but noted that he was not sure of her intent. Comm. Holden indicated that she will do a more detailed description. Mr. Wenger indicated that he would be happy to distribute the press release.

Mr. Wenger noted that he has 2 requests for Non-Public session, 1 relates to updating the Board regarding the status of collective bargaining; he noted that this can be done at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Wenger informed the Board that he has the first version of the Chestnut Street lease for the County Attorney; he noted that he will share it with the Board and it can be discussed at the next meeting.

Attorney Kirby communicated that she has good news to share and explained that the Federal Court dismissed the case of Mr. Marquez v. Hillsborough County Department of Corrections, et al the previous Tuesday. She explained that the Court dismissed the case from the bench; litigation has been going on for many years and it was scheduled for trial the following week. She noted that the Court dismissed the case upon reconsideration of the prisoner's failure to comply with the grievance procedure required under the Prisoner's Litigation Reform Act (PLRA). She congratulated Supt. O'Mara and his staff, noting that it is good to have the case dismissed. Attorney Kirby indicated that she will not, as a rule, belabor the Board with information, but will provide as much information as the Board wishes, and noted that in this case, the staff deserves credit.

Public Comment

Comm. Ziehm asked the Board if there was any public comment. Rep. Robbins introduced himself, noting that he is a member of the Executive Committee. He congratulated Comm. Ziehm on her election as Chair. He noted that he was on the website that morning and learned that there was not a schedule or timetable and wondered if there would be further development as well as Agendas and other information that member of the public, Executive Committee and Delegation could access. He asked if it would possible to find out what is going on and what is coming up. Secondly, he would applaud getting any budget training as early as possible that would help him do his job better. Also, he noted that he understood that the Commissioners attend an average of 38 meetings in a year and inquired how much that relates to in terms of salary per meeting. Mr. Wenger explained that meeting are held every other Wednesday and there are any number of budget and/or special meetings as well.

Rep. Seidel inquired if the Commissioners had considered changing the day of its meetings to another day besides Wednesday when all the Representatives are in session at the State level, noting that it is generally the only day that voting is done. Comm. Ziehm asked how the other Commissioners feel about the request. Comm. Pappas responded that she would like to give the request some consideration; Comm. Holden noted that she would like to review her schedule and also to get input from the Department Heads, noting that Mondays and Fridays are typically bad, so that leaves Tuesday or Thursday. Further discussion ensued.

R. Burns, County Treasurer, responded that Wednesday would be the worst day of the week for him. Comm. Ziehm asked the Board if it wished to change its meeting to Thursdays. Sheriff Hardy indicated that he has one Thursday a month that he would not be able to attend because of another meeting commitment. The Board agreed to give the meeting day further consideration.

Rep. Seidel informed the Board that he is also available to meet with any of the Commissioners and he will share that with the Executive Committee so that if they have concerns, he can communicate any concerns or information.

Mr. Wenger noted that it is typical at this point in the meeting to ask the other Departments if they have input, noting that Human Services, the Sheriff and the Treasurer are at the meeting. Comm. Ziehm asked for input from those mentioned. E. Robinson noted that she will have information at the next meeting; they will be financial spreadsheets and she will get them to the Board in advance assuming the State bill arrives in time for her to do that.

Mr. Burns informed the Board that, regarding to the duties of the Treasurer, and the County's investments, he will meeting with Citizen's Bank the following week and will be at the Executive Committee meeting on January 28th; he explained that it is his understanding that investments will be a "hot topic." In response to a question from Comm. Ziehm regarding meeting with other banks, Mr. Burns explained that the County has investments in banks other than Citizens; he explained that Citizen's Bank handles the majority of the County's transactions. Comm. Ziehm inquired about what happens regarding

the safety of money in excess of the FDIC guarantee of \$100,000. Mr. Burns explained that is an item that will be addressed and noted that when the County invests in Certificates of Deposit and Savings Accounts, the County actually gets a fully collateralized insurance policy on the extra funds; he explained that this results in a lower interest rate, which is a point of contention. He noted that there are laws and guidelines that control how the money can be invested. Comm. Ziehm suggested that the Board and the State Representatives get a copy of that. Mr. Burns noted that he will be making a presentation to the Board and Executive Committee. Mrs. Castonguay informed Comm Ziehm that any financial information that she receives is always sent to the Delegation. Comm. Ziehm went on to offer suggestions relative to what Mr. Burns might provide for information. Mr. Wenger indicated that the statute is Chapter 29 and noted that it is in the book that is provided to the Commissioners and the Delegation members. Comm. Ziehm noted that the booklet is difficult to understand and it would be helpful if the Treasurer would refer to the appropriate statute when doing his presentation. Comm. Ziehm elaborated on her desire to be fully cognizant of the applicable RSA when it relates to her authority to spend money.

9. Adjourn:

There being no other business, a motion to adjourn was entertained.

Motion: To adjourn the meeting. Motion by Comm. Pappas, second by Comm. Holden. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 12:18 p.m.

Signed 2/9/2011

Comm. Carol H. Holden
Vice Chairman/Clerk
Hillsborough County Board of Commissioners

Date