

**APPROVED
TOWN OF PELHAM
BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING
MINUTES
October 25, 2016
APPROVED – November 15, 2016**

CALL TO ORDER - approximately 6:30PM

PRESENT: Mr. Doug Viger, Mr. Hal Lynde, Mr. William McDevitt, Ms. Amy Spencer,
Mr. Paul Leonard, Town Administrator Brian McCarthy

ABSENT: None.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MINUTES REVIEW

Deferred to the next meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENT

- Pelham Farmer's Market – Closed for the season. Possible re-opening May, 2017;
- Fire Station Lawsuit Update – Lynch v. Town of Pelham;
- Horribles Parade – October 30th beginning at 5:30pm from Pelham Memorial School marching to the Fire Station;
- Presidential Election – November 8, 2016 – Expected to have a high turnout – Citizens should plan accordingly;
- Town Clerk / Tax Collector – Office closed November 8, 2016;

Mr. Viger read aloud a draft press release in regard to the Fire Station lawsuit. The Board briefly discussed the verbiage and agreed upon amended verbiage. Mr. McCarthy

OPEN FORUM

No one came forward.

APPOINTMENTS

Health Officer Interviews: Brenda Eaves and Patrick Grow – Possible appointment to position

Mr. Viger stated Ms. Eaves was unable to attend the meeting. He invited Mr. Grow forward.

Mr. Patrick Grow came forward to discuss his application for Health Officer. He provided a brief overview of his experience, and looked forward to becoming more involved with the Town.

Mr. McCarthy discussed the responsibilities of the Health Officer. Ms. Spencer said she clearly saw how Mr. Grow's experience would make him an optimal person in an environmental-type situation. She asked how he would react in a medical situation. Mr. Grow replied he would immediately contact the State and Federal agencies to find out the protocol and put those actions into play. He

described the work he'd done cleaning up oil, biohazards, PCB's, done cleanups for CSX, cleaned lab spills at Harvard and Northeastern; he's worked all levels from home remediation up to Amtrak/CSX.

Mr. McDevitt understood that the State Health and Human Services asks the Health Officer to inspect things such as day care centers before they're licensed and questioned if Mr. Grow was available to do those things. Mr. Grow replied he had flexibility with his work schedule. Mr. McDevitt noted that the Health Officer also serves as Executive Officer of the Board of Health and questioned if he would be available for evening meetings from time to time. Mr. Grow answered yes; his work schedule was 99% days until 3pm.

Mr. Viger saw on the application that Mr. Grow was active military since 1997 and questioned if he had any active service. Mr. Grow answered yes; he served a year in Iraq as the Safety NCOIC because of his OSHA Certifications. The Board thanked Mr. Grow for his service.

Mr. Viger noted the Board had another applicant and would make a decision after reviewing their application. Mr. McCarthy will keep in touch with Mr. Grow.

Discussion - Town owned land lots: Assessing Technician Sue Snide / Conservation Chairman Paul Gagnon. Reference – 1) Atty. Panciocco Map 24 Lots 12-76 & 12-77; 2) Susan & Mark Hilbert Plan 573 Lots 43-48 (known presently as Map 24 Lots 12-76 & 12-77)

Mr. Viger explained that the Board had discussions with citizens and their attorney who were interested in purchasing Town owned lots. Since those meetings other citizens had come forward to request purchasing the same lots.

Ms. Spencer stated she would not be in favor of the Town selling the lots unless, as the Conservation Commission pointed out, there was an environmental restriction on building. She resides on Little Island Pond (her family was there since the 1800's) and discussed the history of the area. She said when looking around the pond there is vast disparities between the buildings and structures and seemed to be reaching a critical mass. She was not in favor of selling Town owned land and essentially doing away with open space unless the land had a conservation easement. She would like the money from the sale to be put into the conservation fund for the purchase of other Town-owned open space. She felt the Board should respect the Conservation Commission's recommendation of placing a conservation easement.

Mr. McDevitt said the pending questions were: 1) should the land be sold, 2) if so, should there be restrictions, and 3) to whom and what process should be used. He felt since there was local interest, it would be a good idea to sell the parcels. He didn't see the compelling public interest to selling the parcels with restrictions. They didn't meet current criteria to be built on. He didn't have a problem selling the lots without restriction. Mr. McDevitt understood there was more than one party that came forward with an interest to purchase and noted they would need to discuss the process. Ms. Spencer spoke about the area and noted there was a sign indicating 'Caution Thickly Settled Area' upon its entrance. She said it was already very cluttered and contentious with various easements. She understood they were speaking of small lots, but felt there was a distinct possibility if combined would be a buildable lot. Given the landscape of the area, she said it didn't seem beneficial to the residents of the area to bring in more livable space. Ms. Spencer wasn't opposed to selling the land to get it back on the tax roll, but would be opposed to doing so without a conservation restriction.

Mr. McDevitt asked for the size of the lots. Ms. Snide replied Lot 76 was 4,792SF and Lot 77 was 3,049SF. Mr. Gagnon believed they were roughly 40ft.x80ft. Mr. McDevitt said he couldn't get excited about placing a restriction on a 7800SF lot because he couldn't imagine putting a house, a

99 well and septic on land of that size. He felt it would impose regulations where regulations already
100 exist. Ms. Spencer said the danger was 3-4 lots in close proximity that a single owner was proposing
101 to own and have the ability to build if those lots were combined. Given the topography and density,
102 she felt it would be detrimental to the area to have additional residential expansion.

103
104 Mr. Leonard believed from the last meeting the Board was considering how to determine a fair price.
105 He understood the responsibility of the Board was to determine if they wanted to sell the lots and to
106 let the Zoning and Planning Boards take over their responsibilities in terms of impact. He felt the
107 Board was overreaching to speculate on the future. Ms. Spencer respectfully disagreed. She stated
108 the Conservation Commission had voted to not sell the land and if it was sold to include a
109 conservation easement. She didn't feel the Selectmen should abdicate to other boards when it comes
110 to making conservation decisions, which she believed was well within their purview. In this case the
111 Conservation Commission had spoken and voted to: 1) not sell the property, and 2) if sold, to include
112 restrictions. Mr. Leonard saw it as the Selectmen siding with one board versus another. Ms. Spencer
113 wasn't opposed to seeking the opinion of the Zoning and Planning Boards. Mr. McDevitt noted that
114 the Planning Board would react to a proposal that comes before them and in this instance it sounded
115 like a hypothetical concept. He felt they would feel uncomfortable responding to such and would
116 want more information.

117
118 Mr. Gagnon noted there had been an instance where the Town sold a 16acre parcel (on the northern
119 end of Town) to an abutter that included a deed restriction (to not be developed). The parcel was put
120 on the warrant with the abutter's name and was approved by the voters. The money from the
121 purchase was put into the conservation fund to be used to purchase other space. He recalled the
122 process had worked smoothly. Mr. Gagnon pointed out that the mission of the Conservation
123 Commission was to preserve open space, so they couldn't vote in favor of selling a parcel to be built,
124 or they would go against their own mission. He told the Board there was no denser portion of Town
125 than around Little Island Pond. He questioned why they would take steps that didn't really benefit
126 the Town and would add to that density. Although he agreed the lots didn't have value to the Town
127 because they wouldn't add trails or be connected to other parcels. The proposed parcels didn't meet
128 the criterion for purchase or maintenance. Mr. Gagnon believed it was likely the purchaser's
129 objective to cobble the lots together, which would put the Zoning Board in a difficult position to deny
130 an application because of the lot size.

131
132 Mr. Lynde said the only condition he would be willing to sell the land is if they preserved the open
133 space. He said because the area was so populated the preservation of open space should be a high
134 priority. He commented if they received approval at Town Meeting, they could sell the property
135 through a sealed bid basis. Mr. Leonard replied with the inclusion of a restriction they would learn the
136 intention of the purchaser. Ms. Spencer agreed.

137
138 Mr. Viger believed the Board should come up with a plan to restrict the property and put in on the
139 warrant to perhaps be sold through sealed bid. Mr. McDevitt questioned what the Town valued the
140 lots at for tax purposes. Ms. Snide replied combined was \$9,000. Mr. McDevitt suggested the Board
141 state a minimum bid. Mr. Leonard discussed the methods and questioned if having a sealed bid or
142 auction was easier. He asked if the current assessed value would be the minimum bid. Because the
143 types of transactions were fluid and changed all the time, Mr. Viger didn't feel the Board should set a
144 specific policy. He suggested exploring whether they should have a policy or review requests on a
145 case by case basis. He said they would need to discuss how to sell property in the future. Mr. Lynde
146 believed everything should be on a case by case basis because they were each unique.

147
MOTION: (McDevitt/Spencer) To seek the authorization of Town Meeting to sell Tax Map 24
Lot 12-76 and Tax Map 24 Lot 12-77 via sealed bid with the restriction that the

lots may not be built upon and a minimum sale price to be \$4,000 total (for both lots).

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

Discussion – Land value and request to purchase Town owned land Map 24 Lot 12-67 on Honor Roll Road – Mr. Bob Gleason, 7 Little Island Park together with Assessing Technician Sue Snide

Ms. Snide told the Board that Map 24 Lot 12-67 contained 7,405SF with a current value of \$50,500 because it is able to sustain a house on it. She said if condition factors were considered, such as being a non-buildable lot, the value would decrease to \$10,100.

Intimately knowing the area and understanding Mr. Gleason's situation, Ms. Spencer was in favor of following the same route taken with the previous discussion (summarized above) including the restrictions and selling via sealed bid with a minimum bid of \$5,000. Mr. Viger noted that Mr. Gleason's septic was currently on the lot being discussed for purchase.

Mr. Gleason was not in favor of a bid process through an auction. He had no objection to some kind of restriction on the lot. He displayed a drawing of the existing layout of surrounding lots he and his brother owned. Alongside the drawing of the existing layout, he showed the Board a drawing of how the lots would be configured (through lot line adjustment) if he purchased the proposed lot. He provided a brief history of the area and how he believed his leach field ended up being on the lot; the lot with his leach field was later taken by the Town for taxes.

Mr. McDevitt spoke about a 16 acre parcel sold by Town on Windham Road, which they believed prior to sale was not likely wanted by other individuals. In regard to the current discussion, he didn't know if anyone would be interested in the parcel. He said with regard to the parcels on last year's ballot there was reason to assume there would be general interest. He was unsure if they should bid the proposed parcel as well. Mr. Viger was concerned with Mr. Gleason being 'handcuffed' due to his leach field location by the Town selling the parcel to someone else. Mr. McDevitt questioned why a lot owned by the Town had his septic located on it. Mr. Viger said the leach field was on the parcel when it was previously taken for taxes.

Mr. Lynde asked for further explanation for how the lots would be configured if the parcel was sold. Mr. Gleason explained how the lots would be combined and the lot lines adjusted. In this case, Mr. Lynde was in favor of selling the parcel with restrictions and put to Town Meeting.

Mr. McDevitt asked Mr. Gleason what he was willing to pay for the lot. Mr. Gleason calculated the square footage at +/- 6,900SF. He didn't know what the right number was and felt \$8,000-\$9,000 was fair but didn't feel \$10,000 was a bad number. Ms. Spencer said given the fact that the leach field was on the lot and there was no other interest, she could be persuaded it was a slightly different situation than the previous discussion. She was in favor of including the restrictions. It was noted that there had been ample opportunity for people to 'weigh in' since there had been several public discussions regarding the parcel. Mr. Viger was in favor of having a warrant article to sell directly to Mr. Gleason.

Ms. Snide noted that a number of the abutters to the parcel didn't live in New Hampshire and weren't privy to the discussions. Ms. Spencer stated she was one of those people for quite some time having her primary residence in New York. She took it as her personal responsibility to stay informed. She said it was a landowner's duty to stay informed and the current meeting, Deliberative Session and Town Meeting to be constructive and sufficient notice. Mr. Gleason noted there had also been two

195 previous meetings. Mr. Leonard said when lots are going to be developed abutters receive
196 notification and felt the Board had due diligence to alert abutters via registered letter that the Town
197 was thinking of selling the parcels on the ballot and invite abutters to review information regarding
198 such. Ms. Spencer disagreed given the Town was not looking to build on the parcel. Mr. Leonard
199 believed the notification privilege wasn't different. Ms. Spencer stated it was different; there's a
200 specific notification given when a person plans to build something or change the character of the land.
201 She said if she was to sell her house she wouldn't have to alert her neighbors. She believed the
202 meeting and the warrant were 'notice'. She said the proposed restriction was that the lot couldn't be
203 built; the character of the land wouldn't change. Mr. Leonard felt the Board should consider sending
204 notification when considering selling land. He noted they had recently sent a courtesy notification to
205 abutters of a hydrogeologist holding a discussion regarding water in the Sherburne Road area. Ms.
206 Spencer reiterated it wasn't required.

207
208 Mr. Lynde felt in this case the Town had a moral obligation given the situation with Mr. Gleason's
209 leach field to deal with the parcel and preserve the open space. He felt selling the lot was the right
210 thing to do because of the preexisting condition. Mr. McDevitt noted that the Voter's Guide was sent
211 to the same address as a property's tax bill, so out-of-Town people would receive an invitation to
212 Deliberative Session. He agreed that in this case the lot should be sold to Mr. Gleason due to the
213 situation of the leach field. Mr. Lynde noted that the lot line adjustments would go in front of the
214 Planning Board and possibly a courtesy notice could be sent prior to that. Ms. Spencer agreed with
215 Mr. McDevitt that the only notice required was due notice.

216
MOTION: (McDevitt/Spencer) To sell to Robert Gleason the lot known as Tax Map 24-12-67
for \$10,000 with the provision that the lot may not be built upon other than its use
for a septic system (*specific verbiage to appear on the ballot*).

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

217
218 Mr. McDevitt said when the time came to draft the warrant article, the Board can discuss having the
219 money from the sale go into the conservation fund.

220
221 Mr. McCarthy told the Board he had just spoken with Attorney Pat Panciocco who submitted
222 information regarding the previous discussion of Map 24 Lot 12-76 & 77. He said she wanted the
223 Board to be aware that there was a possibility that the leaching field for the Norton property may be
224 on the road between the lots being discussed. He asked her to confirm the information. Ms. Spencer
225 noted that the paper street had been dissolved by court order and understood that it would be divided
226 in half and given to the abutter on either side. Mr. Viger saw that the drawing already showed the
227 street split; however, the question about the possible leaching field may create a problem. Mr.
228 McCarthy stated he would remain in contact with Attorney Panciocco. Mr. McDevitt suggested that
229 the Deputy Health Officer be included in the discussion.

230
231 **Presentation – Fire Chief James Midgley presenting communications project**

232
233 Mr. Viger stated the Board had a presentation from Fire Chief Midgley at their previous meeting to
234 move dispatch offsite to Londonderry. The Board tasked him with answering some questions and
235 gathering information. Mr. McCarthy provided the Board with a copy of the proposed agreement that
236 had been reviewed by Town Counsel.

237
238 Fire Chief James Midgley and Deputy Chief Paul Leischner came forward to discuss the
239 communications project. Chief Midgley gave a brief overview of the proposal. He showed a diagram
240 of the current system and then showed a diagram of how communication links would be connected if

they moved dispatch offsite to Londonderry. He discussed the benefits of upgrading the system to an IP based repeater system given the exiting 'tone' equipment that wouldn't be able to be serviced after 2020. He said when that date occurs if they don't have the system in place and a repeater goes down, the entire Police and Fire system would need to be replaced at the same time because IP and tone protocols can't be mixed. The cost of the project including the infrastructure upgrade is \$133,919.

Mr. Viger questioned if there was any opportunity not to use the Jeremy Hill tower. Chief Midgley answered yes; his strategic goal in the next two years is to replace that tower and would like to write a grant to do so. He discussed the old fire tower road, which would be cleared so a tower could be brought in and incorporate Fire, Police, State Police, Forest & Land, Dracut Fire Department and any other State agency that would like to go in. He noted when writing a grant the more population that could be included, the more points they would receive. By moving to a microwave system and getting their own system it would improve the communications infrastructure. In summary, there was nothing included in the proposed project that would eliminate Jeremy Hill, but it one of Chief Midgely's future goals.

Based on the diagram, Mr. Leonard said the current system looked simple compared to the proposal. He questioned if there would be a difference in transmission/response times. Chief Midgley replied it would be better. He discussed the degrading infrastructure on Jeremy Hill and the importance of the proposed project which he felt would drastically improve public safety. Mr. Lynde questioned if the State would be amenable to putting a tower on Jeremy Hill. Chief Midgley said they received tentative approval from Forests and Lands in the past and believed the new director would probably be amenable if the Town allowed them to include their equipment. Mr. Lynde wanted to know the timeframe of the project. Chief Midgely hoped to get the Jeremy Hill project moving within twenty-four months. He noted the \$133,000 project (to move dispatch) he hoped to move forward now.

Mr. Leonard asked if there was a potential revenue from allowing others to join the proposed infrastructure. Chief Midgley replied they wouldn't charge Dracut, who has housed mutual aid for seven years without charging anything. He said with the potential site being Forest and Land's land, they may be approached to put cell tower at the location. He said there may potentially be revenue.

The Board redirected their conversation to the subject of moving dispatch to Londonderry. Mr. Viger understood the cost would be approximately \$133,000. He wanted to know the Town's annual commitments. Chief Midgley replied to begin with they would do a half year costing \$34,125; from that point forward they would have cost increases. He reviewed the costs for the first seven years. Ms. Spencer asked for clarification of the cost. Chief Midgley replied the \$133,000 was the cost for the communications project and set them up for the future. Mr. Viger noted the warrant article would be approximately \$168,125, which would include the cost for the infrastructure and the first six months of a communications contract. Thereafter cost would be included in the Fire Department budget. Mr. Lynde suggested having a warrant article and paying for it through the fund balance because it was critical. There was no objection to pulling the approximate \$168,125 from the fund balance, and going forward pay the annual contract through the Fire Department's budget.

Mr. McDevitt wanted to know what would happen if it got voted down, given the 'no means no' law. Given that there is a legitimate public safety issue that could expose the Town to significant liability, Ms. Spencer questioned if it (\$168,000) could be paid this year if there was sufficient surplus. Mr. Viger was more inclined to pay the infrastructure (\$134,000) out of this year's budget and go back to Budget Committee during reconsideration to add \$34,125 into the Fire Department's budget for the first six months of the communications contract. Ms. Spencer agreed with Mr. Viger's suggestion. There were no other objections. Mr. McCarthy couldn't project the balance, but felt it was conceivable to cover the cost. Chief Midgley noted that the Fire Department would be seeing some

cost savings because they lost two high end employees and brought in two low end employees. There was also a lot of training that had been federally funded.

Ms. Spencer stated she hadn't had the opportunity to go over all the revisions in detail and noted there were a few questions she would like answers to. Mr. McDevitt suggested having Ms. Spencer speak with the Chief and/or Town Counsel through Mr. McCarthy and bring information back to the Board. There was no objection.

OTHER BUSINESS

Vote – Regarding proposal to purchase approximately 30 acres defined as Map 2 Lot 5-72 known as 44 Gibson Road – to be acquired for use as conservation land (*Two public hearings previously held*)

Mr. Viger stated the Board had held two public hearings to discuss the proposal to purchase approximately thirty acres known as Map2 Lot 5-72 (44 Gibson Road) to be acquired as conservation land.

MOTION: (Lynde/McDevitt) To approve the purchase of approximately thirty (30) acres defined as Map 2 Lot 5-72 known as 44 Gibson Road to be acquired for use as conservation land.

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

Vote – To authorize Town Administrator Brian McCarthy to sign appropriate documents for previous matter – purchase approximately 30 acres defined as Map 2 Lot 5-72 (44 Gibson Road)

The Board didn't take action on this agenda item, as Mr. Viger would be available to sign the appropriate paperwork on Friday, October 28, 2016.

Vote – 2017 Town Warrant Articles

Mr. Viger asked that the Board review and vote on the intent and dollar amount of the articles. The wording and order they appear on the ballot will be fine-tuned closer to the time of submission. (*following is the summary of the draft articles*)

A) Compensated Absence Fund – raise and appropriate \$50,000 to be added to the Compensated Absence Fund

MOTION: To accept Warrant Article A.

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

B) Fire Department Ambulance Replacement – raise and appropriate \$240,000 (no amount raised through local taxation)

MOTION: To accept Warrant Article B.

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

332 -----
333
334 C) Fire Department Matching Grant Fund – raise and appropriate \$20,000;
335

MOTION: To accept Warrant Article C.

VOTE: (5-0-0) The motion carried.
336 -----

337
338 D) Highway Block Grant – raise and appropriate \$312,525 (no amount raised through local
339 taxation).
340

MOTION: To accept Warrant Article D.

VOTE: (5-0-0) The motion carried.
341 -----

342
343 E) Highway Department Maintenance Facility – raise and appropriate \$100,000 to be added to
344 the Highway Department Capital Reserve Fund.
345

MOTION: To accept Warrant Article E.

VOTE: (5-0-0) The motion carried.
346 -----

347
348 F) Highway Department Laborer Full-time – raise and appropriate \$62,122 (salary, benefits and
349 equipment).
350

MOTION: To accept Warrant Article F.

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

351
352 It was noted by the Board's vote to include the article, they support the fact that if the Budget
353 Committee amends its By-Laws the article will be eliminated to permit the hire without a warrant
354 article.
355 -----

356
357 G) Municipal Building Roof Replacement – establish a capital reserve fund and raise and
358 appropriate \$100,000.
359

MOTION: To accept Warrant Article G.

VOTE: (5-0-0) The motion carried.
360 -----

361
362 H) Exchange Town owned land with privately owned land – exchange approximately .25 acres
363 of Woven Conservation Area with approximately .25 privately owned land (abutting Currier
364 Road) – even swap.
365

MOTION: To accept Warrant Article H.

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

I) Sale of Town owned land through sealed bid – 1.0 acres located on 18 Chagnon Lane.

MOTION: To accept Warrant Article I.

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

J) Forest Maintenance Funds – raise and appropriate \$31,800 from the fund for forest maintenance/stewardship (*funds are raised from timber harvesting not property taxes*).

MOTION: To accept Warrant Article J.

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

Mr. Viger noted there were two articles submitted by the Library for a full-time ILL/Circulation Librarian and a full-time Emerging Technology Librarian, which the Selectmen had no purview over.

Ms. Spencer questioned if the Town property purchases would be included. Mr. Viger replied the Board voted on the intent and the dollar amount; the wording will need to be fine-tuned.

Review – Quarterly Budget

The Board reviewed the submitted information and believed the Town was doing well at this time.

TOWN ADMINISTRATOR / SELECTMEN REPORTS

Mr. McDevitt suggested introducing a future agenda item to discuss two possible legislative changes that may benefit the Town: 1) State Law on Elderly Exemption requires a person to have resided in the State for five years; however, there is no residency requirement in Pelham; and 2) current State Law requires the Town to take action on a property if a person doesn't pay taxes for three years; there may be some way for people over a certain age the State Law may continue to allow the Town to lien a parcel beyond three years. Mr. Lynde said the Town may be able to do so now. Mr. McDevitt suggested that the Board have a discussion at a future meeting.

Mr. Lynde indicated that the New Hampshire Municipal Association had to increase their dues by 4% next year (approximately \$700) due to changes in support and the need to hire additional employees. He noted the Town had saved more on legal fees than the cost of the possible increase.

Mr. Leonard reported the Elderly Exemption Committee had a great 'kick off' meeting. The committee is comprised of four citizens of Pelham, Assessing Technician Sue Snide, and himself. They spent approximately an hour and a half discussing goals and outcomes and concerns. Across the committee the resounding goal was to help the seniors and maintain pride, dignity and integrity. Everyone took a balanced look and was tasked with coming back with their thoughts so a first draft can be done. Mr. Lynde believed the Town had the right to assist people if they came forward with a justified request. Mr. Leonard replied some people were too proud to come in and request assistance. They've pledged to have a follow up meeting prior to Thanksgiving. The Board suggested submitting a draft article and amend it at Deliberative Session.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/October 25, 2016

Ms. Spencer commended Mr. Leonard and the Elderly Exemption Committee for meeting and moving things forward. She hoped if anyone was struggling they would come forward. She wanted people to know that the Town values and appreciates their contributions.

Mr. McCarthy reminded citizens that a meeting would be held Thursday, October 27, 2016 in Sherburne Hall beginning at 6:30pm with Charlie Head of Sanborn Head Associates to discuss the services they could perform to assess potential impacts from development on area wells. Citizens are invited to ask questions.

Mr. McCarthy provided the Board with a brief update on the following:

- Compactor project will begin shortly;
- Senior Center project is virtually completed. The base coat will be laid down and over winter, they will repave in the spring;
- Although there had been recent rain there was still a dire drought. The State is concerned that once the ground freezes there is a possibility people will start to have water issues. The Governor's office is still asking people to continue to conserve water as it is still a serious issue;
- The Town received insurance numbers from Primex and had an expected increase of 2.9% next year.

REQUEST FOR NON-PUBLIC SESSION

MOTION: (Leonard/Spencer) Request for a non-public session per RSA 91-A:3,II, e
(Consideration or negotiation of pending claims or litigation)

ROLL Mr. Viger-Yes; Mr. Lynde-Yes, Mr. McDevitt-Yes; Ms. Spencer-Yes;

CALL: Mr. Leonard-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 8:50pm.

The Board returned to public session at approximately 8:59pm.

No motion was made to seal the non-public meeting minutes.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: (Lynde/Spencer) To return to public session and adjourn the meeting.

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

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:59pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary