

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

**APPROVED**  
**TOWN OF PELHAM**  
**BOARD OF SELECTMEN - MEETING MINUTES**  
**July 23, 2019**  
**APPROVED – July 30, 2019**

**CALL TO ORDER** - approximately 6:30PM

**PRESENT:** Mr. William McDevitt, Mr. Doug Viger, Mr. Hal Lynde, Ms. Heather Forde,  
Mr. Kevin Cote, Town Administrator Brian McCarthy

**ABSENT:** None

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**MINUTES REVIEW**

**July 16, 2019:**

**MOTION:** (Cote/Lynde) To approve the July 16, 2019 meeting minutes as amended.

**VOTE:** (4-0-1) The motion carried. Mr. Viger abstained.

**ANNOUNCEMENT**

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING:** The Pelham Board of Selectmen will hold two (2) public hearings on Tuesday, July 30th, 2019 & Tuesday, August 13th, 2019 At 6:45 PM in Sherburne Hall, 6 Village Green, Pelham, NH regarding a proposal to purchase two lots of approximately 4.62 acres and 12 acres, defined as Map 32 Lot 2-69 and Map 32 Lot 2-69-3 respectively. Lots located off Spaulding Hill Road. Parcels to be acquired for use as conservation land. For further information, contact Pelham Planning office at (603) 635-7811 to leave a message for the Conservation Commission Chair.

**OPEN FORUM**

No one came forward.

**APPOINTMENT(S)**

**DISCUSSION**

**2020 Budget Review**

Town Finance Director Jean Olson and IT Director Brian Demers were present for budget presentation.

*Assessor – Presented by Assessing Assistant Susan Snide*

2019 Operating Budget \$222,458

2020 Budget Request \$208,974

Salaries – increase per contractual obligation

Supplies – minor increases/decreases mainly due to cyclical revaluation and copier paper costs.

Mr. McDevitt questioned if paper was ordered in bulk for the Town or if individual departments acquired it as needed. Mr. Viger believed the Town purchased ‘bulk’. He noted that the Town couldn’t purchase with the school because their budget was run under a fiscal year. Mr. McCarthy believed each department purchased paper as needed (through a bulk purchase). He said they compared prices through Staples and W.B. Mason.

Under expenses, Ms. Snide pointed out there had been a decrease of approximately \$24,000 because they removed the computer software (Assessing database) cost since it had been purchased the previous year. She noted there were slight changes in the maintenance and cloud backup. She pointed out that the contractual increase for Corcoran was listed for the cyclical revaluation.

Ms. Snide ended by discussing the department’s ‘wish list’ item. She understood the Town would be building caged storage for documents not used on a regular basis. She proposed keeping information electronically (cloud-based storage) to make access to older documents easier. She’s researched the cost and found the initial price would be close to \$10,000 and include an annual maintenance. Documents would need to be scanned so they could have optical character recognition (‘OCR’) for ease of searching for something specific. Mr. Viger questioned if other departments would fall under this category and be incorporated into the costs. Mr. Demers believed other departments could fall into the proposed program. Mr. McCarthy recalled having the various Town departments scan documents.

Mr. Viger understood the cost for scanning and cloud storage would initially be \$10,000. He questioned if the cost would fall under the IT budget if other departments had similar programs. Mr. McCarthy believed it could be moved to the IT budget. He asked Mr. Demers to contact the company for costs so they could see which departments would need that type of storage. He said they would present the Board a number when they came back with the IT budget.

Mr. Cote asked for further explanation of the \$10,000 cost. Ms. Snide began to review the information from the quotes. Mr. McCarthy suggested Mr. Demers meet with Ms. Snide to update the information and create a detail sheet with cost breakdown. He said they would also begin to put the costs together for other Town departments. Mr. Cote stated he was concerned about a repeating cost. Mr. McDevitt questioned if documents were currently being digitized. Ms. Snide answered yes; everything from 2016 to present is digital. Mr. McDevitt wanted to understand the cost benefit to digitizing the old documents versus leaving information on the cards. He said there may be a cost benefit to freeing up storage space within the building. Mr. McCarthy will review the cost benefits and provide information to the Board. Mr. Cote inquired if the Town had to keep the documents. Mr. McDevitt replied there were different rules for each type of record. Ms. Snide stated the

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/July 23, 2019

Town ‘technically’ didn’t have to keep the old tax cards; however, she frequently found useful information on the cards. She would be able to conduct research faster by having the information digitized. She felt the Planning Department would also benefit from having an electronic data base to conduct research.

The Selectmen thanked Ms. Snide for presenting the budget.

***Elections – Presented by Town Clerk Dorothy Marsden and Deputy Town Clerk Linda Newcomb***

2019 Operating Budget \$11,427

2020 Budget Request \$30,779

Increases primarily due to the number of elections that would be held in 2020.

Salaries increase for Supervisors of the Checklist and Ballot Clerks.

Supplies, Postage, Mailings, Expenses, etc. each showed an increase based on the number of elections.

Mr. McDevitt asked about the voting machines. Ms. Marsden believed the Town would be all set.

***Town Clerk/Tax Collector – Presented by Town Clerk Dorothy Marsden and Deputy Town Clerk Linda Newcomb***

2019 Operating Budget: \$248,101

2020 Budget Request: \$262,669

Salaries showed an increase due to contractual obligations.

Supplies showed an increase for postage, envelopes and other small items due to an increase in notices being sent out. There were other minor increases and decreases.

There were no questions regarding the presented budget. The Selectmen thanked Ms. Marsden and Ms. Newcomb for presenting the budget.

***Police – Presented by Police Chief Joseph Roark and Office Manager Celia Lingley***

2019 Operating Budget: \$3,057,575

2020 Budget Request: \$3,196,112

All increases under personnel were contractual based on step and basic rate increases. The overtime rate was averaged at 50.30/hour (based on staffing and historic data). It was noted that the School Resource Officer had now been assigned; the line was previously a placeholder. The DARE (in school) program line showed a decrease since the second school resource officer was now in place.

Mr. McDevitt questioned where the cost was listed for the Officer at the intersection of Sherburne Road/Mammoth Road. Ms. Lingley replied it was in the holidays, traffic detail

line. Chief Roark noted the cost listed covered two hours per day (50 weeks). He said they tried to fill it with a supplemental officer each day; however, many times it's the sector car. He noted until the roundabouts are constructed, they would need an officer at the intersection.

Training – most of the costs are for mandatory trainings.

Supplies – main decrease was in the taser program; those being replaced won't have cameras (based on 'wish list' item discussed later)

Mr. Viger inquired if the surrounding towns took care of Pelham's K-9 issues. Chief Roark replied they were fortunate that several surrounding towns have K-9 programs as well as the State Police. He didn't see the present or future need for Pelham to have a K-9.

The final figures for gas, oil will be set later in the budget cycle by Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Viger asked if the department had seen a savings in the cost for tires by switching to all-wheel-drive vehicles. Chief Roark replied the first set of tires on all their vehicles were very soft high-performance tires that didn't last long. He said the next set of tires were high performance and lasted longer. He said all the vehicles in the fleet were all-wheel drive; however, they worked best in the winter with snow tires. He noted they typically wore tires out before they could rotate them because they had 24-hour use. Mr. Lynde asked if they could request high performance tires at the time of purchase. Chief Roark replied the cruisers came with high performance/all season tires and when replacements are needed, they purchase what's recommended.

Repairs/Projects – contract increase for repeater radio. They split the contract with the Fire Department. As the equipment ages, the costs increase. Computer expenses will cover any items that aren't handled by the Town IT department.

Expenses – slight increase due to addition of officers and historical review of expense line item.

Overall the budget showed an increase of 4.5% which was virtually from contractual obligations.

Mr. Cote asked for an explanation of 'IMC'. Chief Roark replied it stood for 'information management corporation' which was the software 'brain' of the Police Department; everything in the department runs through it. He noted approximately 2/3 of departments in Massachusetts and New Hampshire used IMC as their records management software.

Chief Roark then addressed his 'wish list' item. He provided the Board with information regarding body-worn cameras. He was seeking twenty body plus nine dashboard cameras (\$97,000). He discussed how Legislature had amended the laws to allow for the implementation of programs. He discussed the safeguards that were in place and felt they were a good idea for citizens and the officers. He recommended people visit the Watchguard

website for additional information. The camera software allows the synchronization of body cameras to one another and the ability to link them to the cruiser dashboard camera.

Chief Roark informed that the current dashboard cameras were at the end of their useful life (over ten years old). He spoke highly about the Watchguard company and summarized the needed equipment, service and maintenance.

They can choose to either have cloud-based storage or have their own servers. The recommendation was for cloud storage to allow for automatic uploads and unlimited space. Mr. Demers stated cloud-based would take away from back-room service; however, they would need to ensure they had enough bandwidth to handle the usage. He believed it made sense to have cloud-based storage.

Mr. Viger confirmed that the existing dashboard cameras and audio equipment would be replaced by the dashboard cameras and body cameras in the proposal. Chief Roark stated that was correct. The new dashboard cameras would synchronize the audio with the new body cameras.

Ms. Forde asked how the cost of the cloud-based storage (\$16,000) was determined. Chief Roark replied it was based on the number of cameras. He reiterated it would have unlimited space. Ms. Forde asked if they could work with neighboring towns to possibly share costs. Chief Roark replied none of the neighboring New Hampshire towns have body cameras or dashboard cameras.

Mr. Cote asked where they could research bodycam and dash-cam right-to-know law information. Chief Roark replied a lot of information had been published by the New Hampshire Municipal Association. He discussed at what times citizens could request that the cameras be shut off. Mr. Cote questioned if there were protections against Watchguard releasing video/audio. Chief Roark stated the video was the property of the police and protected; Watchguard will not sell/release information. He spoke about an incident (Burns Road) they had shared on social media. Because it basically became public information, it was later picked up by a television show. He stated the department would sign confidentiality agreements with Watchguard. Mr. McDevitt assumed they would treat the contract as any other and send it to Town Counsel to ensure all questions/concerns were answered.

Mr. Lynde asked if the intent was to include the cost in the budget or have a warrant article. Chief Roark replied he didn't have an issue either way. He noted he included a part-time video technician at \$22.50/hour (50 weeks) for record keeping. The candidate will need computer/technical skills and act as a technician when the physical units need maintenance. Mr. Viger asked if the position would be included in the union. Chief Roark understood that the part-time clerk would not be included.

Mr. McDevitt wanted to know if the software included the ability to edit. Chief Roark answered yes; the software was robust and allowed for the Chief, Deputy Clerk or others to review data on their phones. He stated the Watchguard products were solid.

The Board will consider at the time of voting whether to include the request in the budget.

Mr. Lynde inquired about the status of the dog kennel (animal shelter). Chief Roark replied they provided the information (cost from a couple years ago) to the Capital Improvement Plan committee. Mr. McCarthy believed the next step would be to hire an architect to better understand the needs and costs. Mr. Lynde questioned if the location would be behind the Police Station. Chief Roark recalled the Board had discussed locations in the past and concluded it would be an asset to the community to have it between the Police Station and Library rather than at a remote location.

Mr. McDevitt asked how the body cameras were turned on. Captain Toom explained they were synchronized with the cruiser so when the lights are activated the body camera and dashboard camera are also activated. He noted they also had the ability to manually turn on/off.

The Selectmen thanked Chief Roark and Ms. Lingley for presenting the budget.

***Town Insurance***

*2020 Request: \$2,579,929*

Mr. McCarthy explained the figure was a placeholder that would be updated in November when final numbers are received.

***Retirement***

Mr. McCarthy explained the figure was a placeholder that would be updated in November when final numbers are received. He noted they were also currently in contract negotiations with the Fire Department and had to find out the final numbers.

Mr. Lynde questioned if they could include the old figures in the article until the actual figures were determined. There was a brief discussion regarding how to present the article; there hasn't been a problem in the past by leaving the 'placeholder' until final numbers are received. The article will contain the placeholder figure until Mr. McCarthy receives the final numbers.

**Review a draft Town Ordinance for Pelham Veteran's Memorial Park ('PVMP')  
Pelham Residents.**

Mr. McCarthy provide the Board with the latest document which included all corrections/amendments made by the Board. Mr. McDevitt asked if the Board had an obligation to hold a public hearing. Mr. McCarthy replied he would find out. Mr. McDevitt suggested they plan to do so during their next meeting. Mr. McCarthy stated he would research if a public hearing was required.

**Update on tax lien/Town owned properties.**

Mr. McDevitt recalled there were two properties. Mr. McCarthy stated the legal notices had been sent to the property owners; the process of deeding the properties to the Town had commenced.

**Notice of Intent to cut process.**

Mr. Cote stated the Board had been provided with an Intent to Cut to sign. He was not comfortable signing it given the outcry from people regarding land being clear cut. After researching, he found RSAs that state all permitting applications, etc. were to be filed with the Planning Department prior to cutting vegetation. He felt the RSA was clear, but at the same time felt the Town boards needed transparency between them. Since the Intent to Cut came to the Selectmen first, he felt an obligation for it to proceed correctly.

Mr. McDevitt replied the Board had received a copy of a lengthy email between Mr. Gowan and the Division of Forest and Lands seeking clarification. He understood there was a lack of clarity between the laws. He said the Board would keep the agenda item awaiting clarification from the State. Mr. Cote understood there was nothing on record in the Planning Department. He said individuals came forward to build a duplex with 50-feet of frontage (which requires a Variance). He said there was also a 10-acre body of water in the rear of the parcel that the State has not recognized as a 'significant body of water'. He suggested creating an ordinance for an intent to cut that included a question to determine if there was an intention to create a subdivision or building lot. He said if the applicant indicates they're not going to create a building lot the ordinance could require a time limit (such as five years) prohibiting such.

Mr. McDevitt believed the Intent to Cut was a State form. He said they would have to find out if they could modify the form or have the statutory ability to place a limit. He spoke with the Planning Director and said it appeared the State favors those who want to do the cutting.

Ms. Forde recalled the Conservation Commission asked the Board to set aside money to conduct a survey of the Town's water bodies because the State had redefined the classifications. The study would re-establish certain areas in Town as wetlands. Mr. McDevitt believed the State was strengthening the definitions of prime wetlands. Ms. Forde asked if the land in question was considered such. Mr. McDevitt replied 'prime wetland' could only be defined by Town Meeting. He wasn't sure if the land in question had been. Mr. Cote believed a 10-acre body of water is usually considered a significant body of water; however, the State didn't want to recognize the body of water on the property. He said Conservation Commission Chairman was working to have the State recognize it as such.

Mr. Cote understood the Board had until July 30<sup>th</sup> to sign the intent.

Mr. Lynde was curious to know if the applicant to the Intent to Cut had to list out the different categories. He questioned if it indicated the property would be clear cut. Mr. Cote noted ten acres of the 11.49 acres of the land was to be cleared. He said the remaining area may be the wetland buffer. Mr. Lynde said they may be looking to 'log' the property (selective cut) versus doing a clear cut of the property. Mr. McDevitt said to know if the property is going to be clear cut, they would need to know the number of board feet that are on the property and compare it to what is listed on the form. Mr. Cote stated that's why a timber harvester is hired. He said if done the right way the harvest plan would explain what was being taken and why certain trees were being left. He noted there was no harvester listed on the form.

Mr. McDevitt thanked Mr. Cote for researching.

**TOWN ADMINISTRATOR / SELECTMEN REPORTS**

Ms. Forde reminded people that there will be a children's concert on the Village Green Wednesday, July 24<sup>th</sup> beginning at 6pm.

Mr. Cote reported there was ATV damage done in wetlands that had altered a stream channel. He stated the Forestry Committee had to hire a certified wetland scientist to prepare a restoration plan. He said the ATV issue was growing. He was brainstorming on how to educate people. Mr. McCarthy suggested doing a program that could be played on PTV and social media to speak to the issues and inform of the damages.

Ms. Forde suggested contacting the Border Riders, who may have a mailing list, so information can be sent directly.

Mr. Cote noted he emailed the Board a quote from Delahunty's regarding tree planting. Their quote was \$4,600 that included the trees, planting and one-year warranty. Mr. McCarthy will add an agenda item for the next meeting.

Mr. Cote ended by reporting that the final Capital Improvement Plan committee meeting will be Thursday, July 25<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Lynde recalled in the past there had been significant damage done at Raymond Park. He said cameras were installed. Mr. McCarthy noted that the Police had a new off-road machine that may provide a presence.

**REQUEST FOR NON-PUBLIC SESSION**

**MOTION:** (Forde/Cote) Request for a non-public session per RSA 91-A:3,II,a & c (Personnel; Matter which if discussed publicly could adversely affect the reputation of any person)

**ROLL CALL:** Mr. Lynde-Yes; Mr. McDevitt-Yes; Mr. Viger-Yes; Ms. Forde-Yes; Mr. Cote-Yes

It was noted that when the Board returned, after the non-public session, the Board would not take any other action publicly, except to possibly seal the minutes of the non-public session and to adjourn the meeting. The Board entered into a non-public session at approximately 7:59pm.

**MOTION:** (Lynde/Cote) To leave non-public session.

**VOTE:** (5-0-0) The motion carried.

The Board returned to public session at approximately 8:46pm.

**MOTION:** (Lynde/Cote) To indefinitely seal the non-public meeting minutes.

**VOTE:** (5-0-0) The motion carried.



BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/July 23, 2019

358 **ADJOURNMENT**

359

360 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:46pm.

361

362

Respectfully submitted,

363

Charity A. Landry

364

Recording Secretary

365