



Notice of Award
Drug Free Communities Support Program
Department of Health and Human Services
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
Center for Substance Abuse Prevention

Issue Date: 09/19/2014

Grant Number: 2H79SP015794-06
FAIN: SP015794

Program Director:
Betsy Houde

Project Title: Community Safeguard

Grantee Address	Business Address
MERRIMACK SCHOOL DISTRICT Elizabeth Abrahams 36 McElwain Street Merrimack, NH 030543693	Mark McLaughlin Fiscal Agent Merrimack School District 36 McElwain Street Merrimack, NH 030543693

Budget Period: 09/30/2014 – 09/29/2015
Project Period: 09/30/2009 – 09/29/2019

Dear Grantee:

The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration hereby awards a grant in the amount of \$125,000 (see "Award Calculation" in Section I and "Terms and Conditions" in Section III) to MERRIMACK SCHOOL DISTRICT in support of the above referenced project. This award is pursuant to the authority of DFC Act 1997 (PL105-20) reauth PL107-82 PL 109-469) and is subject to the requirements of this statute and regulation and of other referenced, incorporated or attached terms and conditions.

Award recipients may access the SAMHSA website at www.samhsa.gov (click on "Grants" then SAMHSA Grants Management), which provides information relating to the Division of Payment Management System, HHS Division of Cost Allocation and Postaward Administration Requirements. Please use your grant number for reference.

Acceptance of this award including the "Terms and Conditions" is acknowledged by the grantee when funds are drawn down or otherwise obtained from the grant payment system.

If you have any questions about this award, please contact your Grants Management Specialist and your Government Project Officer listed in your terms and conditions.

Sincerely yours,

Virginia Simmons
Grants Management Officer
Division of Grants Management

See additional information below

SECTION I – AWARD DATA – 2H79SP015794-06

Award Calculation (U.S. Dollars)

Salaries and Wages \$67,600
 Fringe Benefits \$43,697
 Personnel Costs (Subtotal) \$111,297
 Consortium/Contractual Cost \$13,100
 Travel Costs \$603

Direct Cost \$125,000
Approved Budget \$250,000
 Federal Share \$125,000
 Non-Federal Share \$125,000
 Cumulative Prior Awards for this Budget Period \$0

AMOUNT OF THIS ACTION (FEDERAL SHARE) \$125,000

YR	AMOUNT
SUMMARY TOTALS FOR ALL YEARS	
6	\$125,000
7	\$125,000
8	\$125,000
9	\$125,000
10	\$125,000

*Recommended future year total cost support, subject to the availability of funds and satisfactory progress of the project.

Fiscal Information:

CFDA Number: 93.276
 EIN: 1026000547A2
 Document Number: 14SP15794A
 Fiscal Year: 2014

IC CAN
 SP C96R655
 Amount \$125,000

IC	CAN	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
SP	C96R655	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000

SP Administrative Data:
 PCC: DFC / OC: 4145

SECTION II – PAYMENT/HOTLINE INFORMATION – 2H79SP015794-06

Payments under this award will be made available through the HHS Payment Management System (PMS). PMS is a centralized grants payment and cash management system, operated by the HHS Program Support Center (PSC), Division of Payment Management (DPM). Inquiries regarding payment should be directed to: The Division of Payment Management System, PO Box 6021, Rockville, MD 20852, Help Desk Support – Telephone Number: 1-877-614-5533.

The HHS Inspector General maintains a toll-free hotline for receiving information concerning fraud, waste, or abuse under grants and cooperative agreements. The telephone number is: 1-

800-HHS-TIPS (1-800-447-8477). The mailing address is: Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, Attn: HOTLINE, 330 Independence Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20201.

SECTION III – TERMS AND CONDITIONS – 2H79SP015794-06

This award is based on the application submitted to, and as approved by, SAMHSA on the above-title project and is subject to the terms and conditions incorporated either directly or by reference in the following:

- a. The grant program legislation and program regulation cited in this Notice of Award.
- b. The restrictions on the expenditure of federal funds in appropriations acts to the extent those restrictions are pertinent to the award.
- c. 45 CFR Part 74 or 45 CFR Part 92 as applicable.
- d. The HHS Grants Policy Statement.
- e. This award notice, INCLUDING THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CITED BELOW.

Treatment of Program Income:
Additional Costs

SECTION IV – SP Special Terms and Conditions – 2H79SP015794-06

REMARKS:

The Division of Grants Management, SAMHSA is currently conducting a review of your organization's financial management system. If the review discloses material weaknesses or other financial management concerns, grant funding may be restricted in accordance with 45 CFR 74.14 or 45 CFR 92.12, as applicable. The restriction will affect the draw-down of funds from your organization's Payment Management System; all draw-downs will require the prior approval of the applicable Grants Management Specialist and Government Project Officer. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Drug-Free Communities (DFC) Support Program is a collaborative effort between the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). ONDCP issues grant awards to community coalitions through an interagency agreement with SAMHSA. According to the Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997, the purpose of DFC funding is to address two major goals: 1) establish and strengthen collaboration among communities, public and private non-profit agencies, and Federal, State, local and Tribal governments to support the efforts of community coalitions, and 2) reduce substance use among youth and, over time, among adults.

While responsibility rests with the grantee for achieving the primary goals of the program, SAMHSA shall monitor and provide continuing technical assistance, consultation, and coordination in the execution of the project during the funding period. You can find additional details about the support available to you as a grantee on the program's website at

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/ondcp/Drug-Free-Communities-Support-Program>.

In addition to these Terms and Conditions and the applicable statutes and regulations, grantees are bound by the HHS Grants Policy Statement, which can be accessed at <http://beta.samhsa.gov/grants/grants-management/policies-regulations>, and all requirements in the Request for Applications (RFA) for the FY 2014 Drug-Free Communities (DFC) Support Program available at <http://beta.samhsa.gov/grants/grant-announcements/sp-14-002>.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF AWARD

Failure to comply with the Terms and Conditions of the award may result in financial drawdown restrictions on your Payment Management System account or denial of funding in the future as outlined in the following section. Sub-recipients and contractors under grants are subject to the requirements of the cost principles otherwise applicable to their type of organization and to any requirements placed on them by the recipient to be able to comply with the Terms and Conditions of the award. Please refer to the HHS Grants Policy Statement available at <http://www.hhs.gov/asfr/cgabar/aboutog/hhsops107.pdf> for detailed information.

PROGRESSIVE DISCIPLINE AND APPEALS PROCESS

If for any reason you do not comply with the applicable terms, conditions, rules and regulations for the DFC Program, your grant will be subject to the Progressive Discipline and Appeals Process developed by ONDCP and SAMHSA. There are three progressive discipline actions that can be taken: 1) High Risk status, 2) Suspension, and 3) Termination. Failure to comply with special Terms and Conditions may also result in a financial drawdown restriction on your Payment Management System account or denial of funding in the future.

An overview of this plan and the complete explanation and procedures are posted on the Drug-Free Communities Support Program website at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/ondcp/Drug-Free-Communities-Support-Program>.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE GRANTEE

For the purposes of the DFC Program, a "grantee" is either a coalition that has received a grant or is an outside agent that is serving as the grantee on behalf of a community coalition. The following Statutory Eligibility Requirements must be met each year while the coalition is funded by the DFC Program. Failure to meet one of these requirements is considered non-compliance with grant regulations (see Progressive Discipline and Appeals Process).

Statutory Eligibility Requirements for DFC-funded coalitions (if you are the grantee for a separate coalition, you are still responsible for ensuring all eligibility criteria are met by the coalition):

- The coalition must have at least one representative from the required 12 sectors, as outlined in the RFA and the Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997;
- The coalition must maintain meeting minutes that demonstrates it is a unique entity that has substantial involvement from its members and is working toward the goals of the DFC Program;
- The coalition must address multiple (more than one) drugs in its 12-Month Action Plan for each year of funding;
- The coalition must have as its principal mission the reduction of youth substance use;
- The coalition has not received 10 years of DFC funding; and
- The coalition must capture and provide specific data as required by the DFC National Evaluation team.

Statutory Eligibility Requirements for all DFC Grantees (coalitions or outside agents):

The grantee must be an entity eligible to receive Federal funds;

•The grantee must not request more than \$125,000 per year;

•The grantee must document the level of non-Federal match defined in the DFC Act; and

•The grantee can only be awarded one DFC Grant at a time.

Other Requirements for all DFC Grantees (coalitions or outside agents):

The grantee must continue implementing the specific goals and objectives outlined in their approved application for DFC funding. The grantee must develop a funding plan that ensures (1) the required match of requested Federal funds and (2) solicitation of substantial financial support from non-Federal sources for sustainability purposes.

•The lead paid staff (Program/Project Director) of the DFC-funded coalition must participate in The DFC Workstation (<http://www.drugfreecommunities.org>), so that he/she receives information

from ONDCP DFC Staff on a timely basis (see Special Term #7 below for more details).

*The grantee must use the Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF), a five step evidence based process for community planning and decision making.

*The grantee must plan and implement the appropriate environmental strategies as part of their comprehensive 12-Month Action Plan.

Requirements for Grantees in Year 3 and 7:

The coalition must submit via email a Sustainability Plan to the Government Project Officer (GPO) within 60 days of the start of years 3 and 7 of DFC funding. The GPO will review and provide the coalition with feedback on their plan.

RESTRICTIONS ON GRANTEE LOBBYING

(c) Title 18 > Part 1 > Chapter 93 > Section 1913: No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, a jurisdiction, or an official of any government, to favor, adopt, or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation, law, ratification, policy, or appropriation, whether before or after the introduction of any bill, measure, or resolution proposing such legislation, law, ratification, policy, or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to any such Member or official, at his/her request, or to Congress or such official, through the proper official channels, requests for any legislation, law, ratification, policy, or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business, or from making any communication whose prohibition by this section might, in the opinion of the Attorney General, violate the Constitution or interfere with the conduct of foreign policy, counter-intelligence, intelligence, or national security activities. Violations of this section shall constitute as a violation of section 1352 (a) of title 31.

SPECIAL TERMS OF AWARD

1. The grantee must receive and expend non-Federal matching funds as required in the Request for Applications (RFA) and the Drug-Free Communities Act. In-kind support (i.e., donations, volunteer time, etc.) may also be used to satisfy the match requirement.

2. The grantee must comply with the DFC National Evaluation requirements. ONDCP requires all grantees to collect core measures data specific to the geographic area designated in the approved application. The core measures data collection size must be sufficient to provide an accurate and meaningful statistical representation of the people being surveyed in each of the geographical areas served by the coalition.

Data for the following four core measures must be collected and reported every two years on alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and prescription drugs for three grades (5th-12th) with a recommended combination of at least one middle school grade and at least one high school grade:

1. Past 30-day use
2. Perception of risk or harm
3. Perception of parental disapproval of use
4. Perception of peer disapproval of use

The grantee is responsible for providing these core measures data every two years on or before the deadline established for each reporting period as highlighted on the program website at

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/ondcp/information-for-current-grantees>.

Failure to meet established deadlines could result in the GPO placing the grantee on High-Risk status, which could lead to an eventual suspension or termination of the grant for failure to comply with reporting requirements. ONDCP reserves the right to change measures for effective and meaningful evaluation of the program.

3. When requested, the grantee must develop a Corrective Action Plan and complete the approved plan within the designated timeframe designated by the GPO. The Corrective Action Plan must be designed to address identified deficiencies in performance and/or in the conditions contributing or causing the identified unsatisfactory performance.

4. Grantees are required to adhere to all the sections of the Roles and Responsibilities of Grantees as outlined in earlier sections of the Notice of Award (NoA).

5. The grantee must continue to meet the Statutory Eligibility Requirements, as required by the original Request for Applications and the Drug-Free Communities Act during each year of funding.

6. Requests to carryover funds from one fiscal year to another are due to the GMO by the first Monday in February. All such requests must include a copy of the coalition meeting minutes showing coalition approval of the request.

7. The lead paid staff (Program/Project Director) of the DFC-funded coalition must participate in The DFC Workstation (<http://www.drugfreecommunities.org>), so that he/she receives information from ONDCP DFC Staff on a regular basis. This includes submitting the lead paid staff's contact information, as well as the contact information of one member from each of the required 12 sectors. The lead paid staff should discuss the use of The DFC Workstation with sector members chosen to represent each sector, so that they understand their role in distribution of information sent to them. Information sent to specific sectors will always be sent to the lead paid staff. The lead paid staff must participate in the quarterly update of contact information in The DFC Workstation. Lead paid staff will receive an email from The DFC Workstation indicating the update needs to be completed and the deadline for doing so.

8. The DUNS number grantees use on their application must be registered and active in the System for Award Management (SAM) which can be accessed at <https://www.sam.gov>. Grantees must update their SAM information at least every 12 months to maintain an active account.

STANDARD TERMS OF AWARD

1. As required by the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006, this new award is subject to the subaward and executive compensation reporting requirement of 2 CFR Part 170. Although the full text of this regulation is attached, you may access the language online at <http://www.samhsa.gov/grants/subaward.asp>.

The following SAMHSA Term of Award is applicable to all (Type 1) new SAMHSA grants which start on or after Oct. 1, 2010. At this time, Type 2s (competing renewals) and Type 3s (competing supplements) are not included, but may be subject to this requirement in the future.

Reporting Subawards and Executive Compensation

a. Reporting of first-tier subawards.

1. Applicability. Unless you are exempt as provided in paragraph d. of this award term, you must report each action that obligates \$25,000 or more in Federal funds that does not include Recovery funds (as defined in section 1512(a)(2) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, Pub. L. 111-5) for a subaward to an entity (see definitions in paragraph e. of this award term).

Excerpt from the approved 10/19/15 School Board Meeting Minutes

6. Planning for Future Funding of the Student Resource Officer (SRO) Position at Merrimack Middle School

Superintendent Chiafery opened her remarks by noting that because the budget process is just beginning that this would be an appropriate time to begin a conversation about the student resource officer (SRO). Part of a Merrimack Safeguard grant has funded the position of the SRO at the middle school. The question of who will provide the funds to pay for this position once the grant runs out needs to be addressed. The conversation should take into account the value a school resource officer brings to the school.

Superintendent Chiafery has already met with the Town Manager and the Chief of Police about the position. She asked to have Principal Caragher and Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin weigh in on the conversation.

Principal Caragher noted the incredible value the SRO brings to the school culture in several areas. He complimented Detective Prentice and noted the high regard in which he is held. Interactions with students in a school environment rather than from a squad car provides students opportunities to build relationships of trust with the police. The calming force provided in the hallways and lunchroom creates an atmosphere of safety, as does having a trained uniformed officer around in a situation where a student is a potential danger to himself or others. The broad role is challenging to define.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin spoke about the specifics of the grant which was written seven years ago by former Principal Woelflein. Her goal was to put in place an environmental change in the culture of the middle school in an attempt to reduce substance abuse. The grant was to provide seed money to initiate a change with the stipulation that a sustainability plan be built so that when the grant money goes away the change remains.

The grant was a five year grant that Merrimack was fortunate to have renewed for an additional five years. Another factor of the grant specifically states that a sustainability plan must be in place by year seven and the cost of the SRO needs to begin to be assumed in year seven and completed by year ten. Other entities in the community would be expected to assume the financial responsibility for the change. At any time during years seven through ten, if the plan cannot be demonstrated, the seed money could be withdrawn.

The government project officer will visit Merrimack in the Fall to look for evidence that Merrimack has begun a plan to assume total financial responsibility for the change that the seed money is provided for.

Superintendent Chiafery spoke of her conversations with Police Chief Doyle and Assistant Town Manager Cabanel and Business Administrator Shevenell about a the idea of cost sharing arrangement of 51%/49% for this position, with the police department overseeing the position at 51%. She asked the finance director to put forth all of the costs associated with the position in 2015-2016 to assist with next year's budgeting.

Board Member Powell asked if there was a sustainability plan in place in year three and was told yes. That plan had to do with community outreach and the maintaining of relationships with the Youth Counsel. The sustainability plan is defined differently in years three (sustain the momentum) and seven (define the environmental change).

Board Member Powell asked if we would have to reimburse the seed money if we were unable to continue to fund the SRO. Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin explained that upon officially receiving the second award last year, it had to be proven at that time that the expectations of the grant were being met.

Board Member Schneider asked Business Administrator Shevenell to share how the SRO at the high school is funded.

Business Administrator Shevenell stated that the Police Department pays the salary and benefits and that the school district covers the cost of the cell phone and some conferences.

Board Member Guagliumi made the point that the management oversight from the police department will continue and that the funding for both should be from the same source. She suggested that the first step would be to approach the Town Council to wholly fund the position.

Vice Chair Barnes agreed and noted that the school district only has access, not management over the SRO. Therefore the funds should not come from the school district's budget. This is a worthy position but the funding should come from the Town. She also noted that the 49% funding amount is very generous since the school year is only about half of a calendar year.

Board Member Schneider commented that there is no difference in the role of the SRO at the middle school and high school and they should be treated the same.

Student Representative Marcus asked if we would still be eligible for the grant if the SRO was funded by the Town Council rather than the school district.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin answered that the grant does not make distinctions between one pot of money or another. The expectation in the second grant is that there would be a partnering with another community entity. He noted that the distinction between the two SROs is the grant requirement of an environmental change that supports prevention. Prevention is more appropriately addressed in the middle school.

Chairman Ortega made some clarifying points. When the district receives an invoice from the Town for the middle school SRO, the funding comes from the grant. In the proposed construct the Town would invoice the district and \$11,000 would come out of the operating budget and the remainder of the cost would come from the grant leaving a surplus of \$11,000 in the grant for Merrimack Safeguard to utilize.

Business Administrator Shevenell noted that there are additional costs to factor in such as increases in salary, promotions, collective bargaining, and health insurance that would come out of the surplus \$11,000.

Chairman Ortega asked if in order to show progress, the Town took up the funding of the SRO, would they invoice the district for slightly less than the current invoice, leaving additional funds for Project Safeguard to use to promote prevention.

Business Administrator Shevenell answered yes.

Vice Chair Barnes asked if the \$11,000 difference would come out of the operating budget and Superintendent Chiafery answered yes and that the remainder would be paid from the grant. She observed that there seems to be a need to go before the Town Council on the continued funding of the middle school SRO.

Business Administrator Shevenell stated that the School Board, police chief, and administration are committed to the SRO at the middle school. We were fortunate to have this paid for by a grant for the last ten years and we are now trying to have this partnership with the police department continue and assuming a new 51%/49% partnership would be viable. The premise behind that additional \$10,000 in the 2016-2017 operating budget with continued incremental increases, is that it would bring us to the 49%, (\$50,000) needed by year five when the grant goes away.

Chairman Ortega thought that the sustainability should not come from the School Board but from the Town. He acknowledged that the School Board is in favor of continuing to have an SRO at the middle school. He spoke to the strong partnership that exists between the School District and the police department.

Detective Prentice was highly praised by Chairman Ortega, Principal Caragher and others throughout the discussion.

Chairman Ortega commended the administration for taking the initiative in looking at the grant and ensuring that a sustainability plan was in place. He noted that the district was quite fortunate in getting the second grant that covered years six through ten.

Chairman Ortega noted that Detective Prentice while he works at the middle school, he is a police officer first.

Chairman Ortega recommended that the appropriate action might be an agenda item at a Town Council meeting relating to Merrimack Safeguard and the need for a sustainability plan expressing the School Board's position. At the minimum would be a joint meeting between the School Board, Town Council and Police Department.

Board Member Schneider asked if the amount of grant money we receive now covers the cost of the SRO and if the intent behind the grant is that excess funds are to go into Merrimack Safeguard for other uses.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin responded yes, that written into the new grant are enhancing community outreach such as when Lynn Lyons comes to the community to speak on anxiety and that the project coordinator's role needs to be expanded to make connections with other coalitions.

Board Member Schneider stated that at the last Merrimack Safeguard meeting there was a discussion on where to get funds for advertising and publicity. He thought that tonight's discussion needed to be brought up at the next Merrimack Safeguard meeting.

Student Representative Marcus went on record as disagreeing on the funding source of the SRO. He recommended keeping as much influence as possible over the SRO position because of the profound and direct effect on education and educational facilities. He thought that the influence should be held with the School Board where education is the prime priority.

Chairman Ortega thanked Student Representative Marcus for his valued opinion.

Chairman Ortega returned to Board Member Schneider's question on the funding for Merrimack Safeguard, which now comes entirely from the grant. When looking at a partnership, the funding of the SRO is one component and the funding of outreach and promotion is another component that the Board might want to entertain supporting as a cost sharing endeavor as it relates to the program but not the funding of the position.

Board Member Guagliumi added that some of the other training costs we have incurred might be included in this support.

Chairman Ortega will formally request a joint meeting with the Town Council to discuss Merrimack Safeguard and other common interests.

1 good idea as not many people go to Town meeting or pick up a copy of the Town Report, and actually
2 look through the detail. If we provide the service of including it in the letter that goes out with their tax
3 bill we are providing, at minimum, a brief explanation as to how we arrived at this particular figure. At
4 least tax payers would know where to go to get their questions answered.

5
6 Councilor Rothhaus remarked the way the budget comes out it might be \$25 million one year and \$32
7 million the next. When people see that a lot of people go into panic mode thinking spending went up
8 30%. The newspaper did that when it reported a 10% increase, and the Council was sitting back
9 thinking what meeting were you at. For him this piece points out the actual increase. He believes
10 providing that information is important for the Town because of the way the budget is portrayed.

11
12 Councilor Rothhaus commented that perspective was helpful as were the comments regarding the
13 Annual Report. If that is how the insert is worded and the true intent that is helpful. If the insert is
14 included in the December property tax bills it is a good explanation, but by the time you get to the
15 Annual Meeting in March it could be completely gone from people's thoughts. She reiterated the need
16 to be careful and do a fine job with the wording to avoid unintended consequences.

17
18 Chairman Harrington stated she would not want anyone in Town to think they don't have an influence
19 when they come to the microphone during budget season or through letters sent. Councilor Vaillancourt
20 stated she had not intended to imply that. It is simply that you hear people complain all the time, and
21 her response is run for office to have that voice. She spoke of the importance of taxpayers speaking
22 before the Town Council, Budget Committee, School Board, etc. during their budget deliberations.

23
24 *The general consensus was support of including an insert with changes to the wording.*

25
26 Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Paul Micali stated he would place the item on the agenda for
27 the Retreat and on an October, 2016 meeting agenda.

28 29 **5. Joint Town Council / School Board Meeting**

30 *Submitted by Town Council Chairman Nancy Harrington and Vice Chair Tom Mahon*

31 Discussion about the proposed joint meeting and potential topics.

32
33 Chairman Harrington stated there has been a request to initiate a discussion about the School Resource
34 Officer (SRO). Four years remain in the grant. However, the grant language indicates a requirement to
35 demonstrate planning for the continuance of the position at the end of the grant. The language
36 specifically speaks to such planning occurring in year seven (next year). That requirement initiated
37 discussion of conducting a joint meeting between the School Board and the Town Council.

38
39 Chairman Harrington stated another subject she would like to be included on the agenda is related to the
40 tennis courts. The Town is in the process of obtaining clarifications from the New Hampshire
41 Department of Resources and Economic Development (DRED). Councilor Dwyer commented there
42 will now be sufficient information available to be able to make a real policy decision. A date and time
43 for the joint meeting has not yet been scheduled.

44
45 Councilor Dwyer questioned if the Council could engage in a discussion of the SRO, and provide the
46 Town Manager with advice to be shared with the Superintendent so that the issue could be worked out
47 without the need for a joint meeting.

1 Chairman Harrington stated a desire to include additional items on an agenda for a joint meeting. There
2 are questions she would like answers to prior to a discussion of the SRO. She stated her opinion
3 whatever determination the Council comes to, after being provided with the information necessary to
4 reach a decision, should take place in front of the School Board. Councilor Vaillancourt stated her
5 opinion it is a position that is important to the community and worthy of a joint meeting between the two
6 bodies. She agreed any deliberations should be done publicly and with both bodies face to face.
7

8 Councilor Vaillancourt suggested the proposed pipeline could be an agenda item. She remarked
9 although there may be nothing for the two entities to discuss jointly, she is of the belief the school
10 district is far behind where they should be regarding information. She is unsure if there is any formal
11 discussion that would benefit the entire Town regarding the pipeline and the process.
12

13 Councilor Koenig commented a review of the meeting minutes from the last joint meeting indicates a
14 good deal of discussion took place around polling places and security at schools for polling places. He
15 is unsure if anything has come of that. He would want to touch on the subject. Assistant Town
16 Manager/Finance Director Paul Micali stated he and the Superintendent did follow-up after the last
17 Town election, and did not identify any issues that require addressing. With a Presidential Primary
18 coming up there might be some tweaking that needs to occur. The high school will be utilized for that
19 election and schools will be closed. Councilor Boyd questioned if it would be appropriate to invite the
20 Town Moderator and the Town Clerk/Tax Collector to participate in that discussion.
21

22 Councilor Dwyer stated his position, which has not changed in the five years he has sat on the Council,
23 that the Town is responsible for the Police Department. If, in the future, the Federal Government stops
24 providing the grant funding for that officer, he would support the recommendation of the Police Chief.
25 If the Police Chief requires an additional office, and if it his management decision to place that officer at
26 the school, he would support that. Chairman Harrington remarked she does not disagree. However, the
27 Council needs to be able to make budgetary decisions. If a consensus is reached that supports that
28 position, it can be documented in paperwork required in the grant process. Councilor Boyd questioned
29 the Council obligating a future Council. Councilor Vaillancourt stated that decision does not have to be
30 made right now. She noted the officer is a Juvenile Officer in addition to an SRO. The position of
31 Juvenile Officer is a function within the Town not the School. But there are other programs and
32 initiatives that the Federal Grant pays for, and that are required by the Federal Grant. It is her belief the
33 School District may be responsible and willing to support some of those initiatives. If they are required
34 to continue, that would be something that would be appropriate for them to put in their budget. It is not
35 just the position and the salary. There are other programs/functions that are being funding with these
36 grant dollars as required by the grant.
37

38 Chairman Harrington stated her understanding what brought up the topic is the requirement for a
39 discussion given part of the grant is to be able to ensure the sustainability of the position. Part of that
40 discussion has to do with who will cover the cost. Councilor Vaillancourt responded there is something
41 very specific about year 7. It is not the entire amount that the Town has to budget for. Chairman
42 Harrington stated she would need clarification in advance of a joint meeting.
43

44 Councilor Vaillancourt stated it is complicated and has a lot of moving pieces. The School District is
45 well versed with monies that come in and go out and what the requirements are. All of those questions
46 could be answered. She stated, from having participated in Merrimack Safeguard for years and having
47 watched the School Board meeting where they discussed this, she is aware they talked specifically about
48 a portion of money going toward their budget for year 7, but it was not the entire salary.
49

1 Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director Paul Micali stated they were starting to budget a percentage.
2 If they were going to fund 49%, they were going to fund it over several years; 10%, 10%, 10%, 10% so
3 that it is not a big hit. Councilor Vaillancourt questioned how that could be done when they cannot
4 retain funds. It was explained they would not retain the funds. Assistant Town Manager/Finance
5 Director Paul Micali explained he would request \$110,000 for an SRO from the School. They pay him.
6 It comes from wherever. Next year when they put it in their budget he would request \$110,000 for the
7 SRO. They pay the \$110,000; \$11,000 comes from their budget, \$99,000 comes from the Federal
8 Government. They use that other money from the Federal Government to offset other expenses that are
9 part of the Operation Safe Commute. He explained further the Police Chief is very versed in this as well
10 as an individual on the school side. He suggested if the Council would like a presentation provided on
11 the planning process from years 7-10 he is confident the individuals would be happy to come to a future
12 Council meeting to provide one.

13
14 Town Manager Cabanel commented where discussing a \$100 million collective budget, a maximum of
15 \$70,000, and how it will be split between the School District and the Town, which is really the same
16 thing; it is all the same tax bill. Getting into percentages and long presentations, to her is a total waste of
17 time. Councilor Dwyer stated agreement.

18
19 Chairman Harrington stated the Superintendent has indicated she would like it stated that the School
20 District would fund 49% of the position and the Town would fund 51%. Councilor Vaillancourt
21 remarked that was the Superintendent speaking not what the School Board was indicating. Chairman
22 Harrington stated the School Board will have to make a decision. Councilor Vaillancourt reiterated a
23 decision should be made jointly. She remarked if there are questions about the grant and the process,
24 having a presentation prior to the meeting would make the joint meeting go more smoothly.

25
26 Chairman Harrington questioned the will of the Council. Councilor Dwyer remarked the grant is in
27 place for a few more years. When the time comes that the grant is gone then it is the management of the
28 Town, with the Police Chief. The Police Chief, in cooperation with the Superintendent and the Town
29 Manager, will make a management decision with regard to where Officers will be stationed. He
30 reiterated he believes it is completely under the management of the Police Department.

31
32 Chairman Harrington stated it to have been her misunderstanding that there was a reasonable sense of
33 commitment that the School Board would need from the Council, and remarked it sounds as if that is not
34 accurate. Town Manager Cabanel stated her opinion the important issue is that the boards get together
35 and talk about the importance of an SRO and keeping the position in service regardless of the grant.

36
37 Chairman Vaillancourt stated her belief the position of a Police Officer belongs with the Police Chief
38 and that it is part of the Police Department budget. She spoke of discussions in prior years regarding the
39 budgeting of positions such as a crossing guard. If there is a question about who should pay for this
40 Police Officer when the grant runs out then we should have a discussion and we should have it now.

41
42 Councilor Boyd stated agreement; the SRO is a Police Officer. When the grant ends the position
43 specifically reports to his chain of command directly up to the Chief of Police. It will be the
44 responsibility of the Chief to deploy his/her officers as he/she sees fit. Ultimately it is the Town's
45 decision as to whether or not to pay for the position, and if he is on the Council in 2020 when that comes
46 up he will support it.

47
48 Vice Chairman Mahon questioned if he was hearing that the Town is required to retain that position
49 after the grant ends. Councilor Vaillancourt stated that is not the case. Vice Chairman Mahon remarked

1 all we are talking about is what will happen between now and when the grant ends. Councilor
2 Vaillancourt stated if the Town does not start making commitments next year, continuing years of the
3 grant could be lost. Vice Chairman Mahon stated the money belongs in the Police Department plain and
4 simple. It is cleaner, there is accountability, and it may be a requirement for the officer to be certified,
5 etc.

6
7 Town Manager Cabanel commented she believes that feeling is throughout the State; that School Boards
8 and Towns are squabbling back and forth about how these positions will be funded. The reason is
9 because there were periods of time where everybody's budgets were being crunched. The Police Chief
10 would say, for instance, I have been tasked to reduce \$150,000 from my budget, and I have to deal with
11 my own critical mission, and that is not one of them, so I'm not going to let go one of my officers and
12 pay for this one. None of that is going on right now. The economy has improved, relationships are
13 better, etc. Those types of discussions are no longer being heard around the State. Councilor Dwyer
14 added the Police Department's critical mission has changed when it comes to schools. It is a different
15 topic today.

16 17 **6. EDCAC Role for the Upcoming Year**

18 *Submitted by Councilors Dan Dwyer and Bill Boyd*

19 To task the Economic Development Citizen Advisory Committee with an assignment for the
20 upcoming year.

21
22 Councilor Dwyer remarked the Economic Development Citizen Advisory Committee (EDCAC) has
23 done a lot of good things over the years. Some years were off years because they were not given
24 direction/tasks. It is important to remember they are a task oriented group. In accordance with their
25 Charter, unless the Council gives them an assignment they really don't have the authority to do
26 anything. The EDCAC has worked well with Tim Thompson, Director, Economic Development
27 Department and the department.

28
29 Councilor Dwyer suggested the EDCAC be tasked with identifying the growth of the top 25 businesses
30 in Merrimack (or the top 10 and then round it off with the rest of the businesses in Town). They could
31 produce a document that would be valuable to the Council as a means of becoming more familiar with
32 the businesses in Town. The information could include addresses, phone numbers, the number of
33 employees, what the company does, etc.

34
35 Councilor Dwyer spoke of the value of volunteers, and suggested if the Council cannot identify worthy
36 tasks perhaps the lifespan of the EDCAC has come and consideration should be given to disbanding it.
37 There are valuable volunteers who have donated their time to the EDCAC who could perhaps be asked
38 to consider joining the Planning Board or any of the other Boards, Commissions, and Committees in
39 Town that are in need of volunteers.

40
41 Councilor Boyd stated the EDCAC is currently working with the Community Development Department
42 on the development guide. That is primarily where their focus has been. Director Thompson has
43 indicated to him that Jillian Harris, Planning & Zoning Administrator will be working with the EDCAC
44 on that development guide. They do have one particular focus currently. He had emailed the
45 Chairwoman of the EDCAC explaining the genesis of Councilor Dwyer's idea, and his belief it has
46 merit to put in the pipeline. He has not had the opportunity to follow up with her on that.

47
48 Chairman Harrington questioned the status of the development guide. Councilor Vaillancourt stated the
49 impression she has is they are not close to completion. Councilor Boyd stated they are not. Councilor