

by voters at Town Meeting) to accommodate the parking area. She asked for the Board's permission to proceed.

The Board reviewed the depiction of the proposed parking area and photographs of the area. Mr. Gagnon reiterated that the parking area would accommodate three vehicles; the conservation area was fairly small (approximately 22-23 acres). They didn't expect the area to draw the kind of crowds that the Merriam-Cutter areas draws. Mr. Gagnon noted that the expense for the gravel parking area will be covered by the Forestry Committee timber harvest revenues and not be from tax revenue.

Mr. Lynde told the Board that the plan was presented to the Planning Board, abutters were notified. They had a lengthy discussion and approved the concept. He said there were issues raised and addressed. Ms. Waters added that they were sensitive to concerns and pointed out that the parking area was not much different from a normal driveway.

MOTION: (McDevitt/Lynde) To approve the proposal for the parking area.

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

Discussion/Vote – Highway Road Agent Frank Ferreira – Plowing Private Roads

Mr. Viger stated that the Selectmen had previously discussed the maintenance of private roads and the associated costs to the Town. There were some concerns regarding what was being charged versus the actual costs.

Mr. Ferreira told the Board that they currently charge \$4,600 per land mile and should be charging \$5,542. He said if the Selectmen decide to continue plowing private (or unaccepted) roads, they would have to increase the price to cover the costs. He noted that the figure didn't include the cost to send the backhoe to the areas to move snow after big storms. He added some of the new developments had raised basins that damaged plows. Maintaining these areas, especially the pond roads, took time away from plowing regular roads. Information was given to the Board from the New Hampshire Municipal Association's ('NHMA') handbook "A Hard Road to Travel" regarding maintenance of private and Class VI roads. Mr. Ferreira referenced the first paragraph that read 'Municipalities should refrain from regularly maintaining, for example plowing, private roads and driveways for several reasons.' He noted that the liability exposure increases and suggested that the Town may want to think about stopping.

Ms. Spencer stated she lived on a publicly dedicated road up by Little Island Pond and felt strongly that the Town should continue to plow the private roads at full cost. She had spoken to several citizens on Little Island Park Road who understood and were willing to pay more. She wanted the Board to understand what it would take for the citizens to clear their own roads to accommodate emergency response. She believed doing so may be cost prohibitive and also increase liability exposure if they were not able to adequately clear the road. She said no one wanted to be in a position of not being able to properly service a citizen who pays taxes for those services. Ms. Spencer reiterated she felt very strongly they should charge cost, including maintenance of vehicles that take on extra damage due to the quality of roads. She was in favor of continuing to plow private roads.

Mr. Viger asked what was currently being charged. Mr. Ferreira replied they currently charged \$4,600 per land mile; the proposal was to charge \$5,542. He noted that cost didn't include damages, or the cost of running a machine to the area for a second or third time. Mr. Lynde believed all costs needed to be covered because the Town was not allowed to spend any tax dollars on those roads. Mr. Viger stated actual costs needed to be identified, so residents feel they could get a better price from a

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/October 3, 2017

93 landscaper they could have them do the roads. Ms. Spencer and Mr. McDevitt agreed. Mr. Ferreira
94 commented there were private roads that were maintained by the residents.

95
96 The Board understood that the proposed figure of \$5,542 was solely for plowing and not sufficient to
97 cover sand/salt, potential damage and the possible need to bring out heavy equipment. Ms. Spencer
98 proposed that Mr. Ferreira come back at the next meeting with actual numbers. She questioned if the
99 Board could vote whether or not to maintain the roads and let Mr. Ferreira set the actual costs. Mr.
100 Lynde said if they knew the cost of plowing, but didn't know the cost of the unknowns, they shouldn't
101 do the unknowns. Mr. Viger replied once the Town was engaged, they would be obligated. Mr. Ferreira
102 noted the costs varied depending upon the winter storms; there's an area off Spaulding Hill Road where
103 the snow drifts and they have to go back more than once to clear the road.

104
105 Mr. Leonard suggested creating a 'menu' of rates for billable maintenance, such as sand/salt, loader
106 removal. He said it could basically be a subcontractor activity.

107
108 Ms. Spencer spoke about the difference between new developments (developer owned) versus existing
109 homes on roads put in prior to Town specifications. She felt at this date, it would be unfair to require
110 some neighborhoods to completely redo their roads before the Town continued to provide services this
111 year.

112
113 Mr. McDevitt believed it was important to understand there were two groups of roads, 1) those owned
114 by developers that haven't been accepted by the Town, and 2) 'pond' roads/private roads. He recalled
115 the Town began plowing new development roads because they were receiving complaints from people
116 who had purchased homes and were paying taxes and couldn't get out of their neighborhood. He said
117 at the time they felt the right thing to do was to charge. Mr. McDevitt also recalled a time when the
118 Town plowed all the roads, but there had been a lawsuit that put a stop to them plowing private roads.
119 After which they came up with the idea of charging for plowing and at that time they discussed the
120 requirement for the road to be maintained to reasonable Town standards. He was in favor of keeping
121 up what they've been doing and felt it would be an awful time to tell residents now that the Town
122 wouldn't plow in the winter. However, he believed the private roads should be kept to a reasonable
123 standard set by the Town. He felt the same way about the developer's roads, and suggested charging
124 them per storm, since they had the option to maintain the road themselves.

125
126 Mr. Viger felt they needed a real number of what maintenance/plowing would cost, taking into account
127 any damages to the plow trucks. He believed they owed people a number so they would have enough
128 time to go elsewhere. Ms. Spencer agreed. She said if a road wasn't up to a reasonable standard the
129 Town should let people know in August to have enough time to come out and fix the road. She felt
130 October was too late to do so. She was in favor of increasing the price this year and begin road
131 inspections starting in the spring or summer. Mr. Ferreira replied he did inspections when they sent
132 out the notices (by the end of October); they've always done this. He said he gives them a list of things
133 that need to be done prior to the Town plowing. Ms. Spencer questioned if the residents are told that
134 their road won't be plowed unless the items on the list are done. Mr. Ferreira answered yes; they are
135 all told and they all fix the items.

136
137 Mr. Lynde read aloud a portion of the information contained in the NHMA 'A Hard Road to Travel'
138 handbook, which spoke about how public funds must be dispensed for public purposes. He stated the
139 residents should be forewarned that there may be add-on costs in the event of a severe winter that
140 required additional plowing; they will have to fully recover the costs.

141
142 Mr. McCarthy suggested drawing up a contract to shield the Town from liability and possible lawsuit.
143 It could also state that at the end of the plowing season the Town may bill for certain unanticipated

costs. Mr. Viger stated the original intent of the discussion was that the Town was plowing the roads for a period of time at a loss. He wasn't interested in entering into a contract where the Town was bound to plow roads, where statutorily, they were not required to. Ms. Spencer believed Mr. McCarthy was suggesting entering into an agreement for a specific winter. She said the agreement would state the base cost of \$5,542 per mile; in addition, at the end of the winter there may be unanticipated costs that the Town will bill in addition based on the costs of the winter. She believed this would allow the Town to recover 100% of the expenditure without underestimating/overestimating, or binding the Town in the future. Mr. Viger felt that would be a lot of work and would bind the Town for that winter. He said the Town was not obligated to plow the roads, it was a service. Ms. Spencer replied a contract wouldn't come into existence until the Town decided they were going to plow and didn't understand how it wasn't a practical solution to achieve 100% recovery of costs. Mr. Viger questioned why the Town should enter into a contract for something they don't have to engage in.

Mr. Leonard commented there were terms 'employee at will', 'tenant at will' and suggested that the Town be a 'provider at will' and agree to plow roads for the amount of \$5,542, plus any additional expenses providing that roads are maintained. He said if a neighborhood decides not to maintain their road, or pay the Town, the Town will cease plowing the roads. Mr. Viger didn't understand why the Town would obligate itself to do something they weren't required to do, that could somehow put obligation on the Town in the future. Mr. Leonard said doing so would basically be a statement of work on behalf of the Town based on the neighborhood making sure their private road had no deficiencies prior to the plowing season. Mr. Viger said the Town has been doing that all along. He said the thing that's changed was the amount being charged was different from the actual costs. The amount the Town had been charging was \$4,600 and the proposed new amount was \$5,542. An additional changes was to have language stating: 'damage to Town equipment shall be billed to the street or development'.

Mr. Viger questioned if the new charge of \$5,542 would cover broken/damaged equipment. Mr. Ferreira answered no; the figure was an average cost using data from the last two years. Mr. Viger wanted to know if the Town could include a cushion for broken equipment. Mr. McCarthy said to do so Mr. Ferreira would need to go through maintenance records and put together a number. Mr. Viger suggested rounding the figure to \$6,000. Mr. Ferreira said he was going to make that suggestion, noting the figure could be adjusted next year.

Mr. McCarthy questioned how plowing private roads impacted the Town's ability to take care of its regular roads and wanted to know if it caused a delay. Mr. Ferreira replied there were 6.1 miles of private roads. He said if they weren't plowing those (private) roads, it would increase the efficiency on Town roads.

Mr. Viger asked Mr. Ferreira if he wanted to continue maintaining the 6.1 miles of private roads in the future. Mr. Ferreira stated it would be nice to get out of doing them, but understood the decision was for the Board to make. Mr. Viger commented that the Town could give the roads the \$6,000 figure for this winter, and in June let them know the Town was transitioning away from plowing to give them time to find alternate maintenance.

Mr. McCarthy understood the Fire Department ran a plow truck in bad weather along with the engine and the ambulance. Mr. Ferreira stated that was correct.

Mr. McDevitt believed it was too late this year to tell people the Town wouldn't plow. However, he felt the Board should revisit the discussion in the spring and provide a reasonable amount of time to make other arrangements.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/October 3, 2017

Mr. Viger asked Mr. Ferreira if \$6,000 was a reasonable amount. Mr. Ferreira believed it should be; he will keep better track of costs for additional plowing and any damage. Mr. Lynde assumed the mileage included two passes (one pass in and one pass out of a road). Mr. Ferreira replied the 6.1 miles of private roads was one way; the total was 12.2, but they were only charged per mile. Mr. Lynde confirmed that the cost covered plowing both ways. Mr. Ferreira answered yes. Mr. McCarthy pointed out if the Town got into a liability situation it would typically be a big number. He was concerned about the insurance company not representing the Town if they were doing something they shouldn't be. Mr. McDevitt believed the Town had statutory protection when doing regular Town roads in the normal course of duty against liability. His understanding was that the Town didn't have statutory protection when plowing a private road. Mr. McCarthy will contact the insurance company for answers.

Ms. Spencer believed the Town would be exposed if they walked away, because the Town was obligated to provide emergency services to citizens and taxpayers. She said if they couldn't provide those services due to the road not being cleared it may expose the Town to liability and risk of a lawsuit. Mr. Viger agreed and stated there was no limitation to anyone bringing a lawsuit forward. He believed there was a consensus of the Board to make the amount \$6,000 and reevaluate by June and determine if it's a real number.

MOTION: (Leonard/Spencer) To approve \$6,000 as the amount for private road plowing.

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

Discussion – State Representative Greg Smith – House Bill 324

Representative Smith told the Board that he was on the Science and Technology committee. He was interested in hearing the Board's view.

Mr. Lynde explained that House Bill 324 would take the authority of assessing utilities from towns and turn it over to the Department of Revenue Administration ('DRA'). He noted towns are guided by a provision in statute to assess things (residential, commercial, utility, etc.) at their highest and best value. In the past DRA had done appraisals, but they found it was more beneficial to the Town to do their own because the DRA wasn't appraising utilities on the same basis that towns were obligated to appraise all properties. He said they hired an expert to conduct the appraisal, which was always upheld in court. Mr. Lynde stated if the DRA were to take over the appraisals, the loss would estimate at \$20 million in assessed value. He said the most disturbing thing was that a lot of the towns were sued by electric utility company, and it went up to the Supreme Court. The DRA supported the utilities, when they should have supported the towns. The Supreme Court threw the case out, stating there was no basis. He felt the Bill was an end run around the situation that would cost a significant amount to the towns. He said he wanted Representative Smith to oppose the Bill.

Representative Smith told the Board that the Bill came to the Science and Technology committee and they voted to retain it because there were some issues. He noted this was the first time in his experience as representative that the whole District 37 contacted him to say they had a huge problem with a bill. He saw that it was a non-partisan Bill and discussed the arguments he had heard. Representative Smith took his position seriously and told the Board he was strongly leaning in opposition (Inexpedient to Legislate 'ITL'). Mr. Lynde said there would be no problem if DRA used the method as required by Statute. He wanted Representative Smith to bring the message back to ITL. Representative Smith appreciated the feedback.

Mr. McCarthy asked that the Board discuss the Keno law change. Mr. Viger wanted to know the State's opinion and how it would operate. He understood that Keno would be opened up in the State, but it

would be up to local municipalities to vote on it via warrant article. Representative Smith said there was a proposal to offer all-day kindergarten, which lead to questions of how it would paid for. He said the compromise was to tie it to Keno.

Mr. McDevitt said he wasn't a gambler, but suggested they put together a warrant article. He felt there were local businesses that may benefit from having it and thought the Board should at least put it in front of the citizens. He understood that Keno and full-day kindergarten weren't linked. Representative Smith also understood that funding was not linked together. He said if a town had all-day kindergarten they could get additional supporting funds from the State. Mr. Viger believed it went into the gambling/education bill, which included scratch ticket, etc. with the caveat being the State could then afford full-day kindergarten. Representative Smith stated it was a way to make the numbers work. The revenue would go to the State, and the State (after taking a portion) would redistribute back to the towns.

The Board thanked the Representative Smith for meeting with them. Mr. Lynde recommended that the Board put together a letter, addressed to Science and Technology committee, regarding their opinion of House Bill 324.

Discussion – Fire Chief James Midgley – 2018 warrant article

Fire Chief James Midgley and Deputy Chief Paul Leischner came forward to discuss a proposed warrant article for the 2018 Town ballot. Chief Midgley commented there had been dwindling numbers through the years for the call department staffing and they knew at some point they would need to look at possibly bringing on other full-time staff. He said the goal was to determine how they could do so, while having as little impact on the taxpayer.

Deputy Leischner provided the Board with a copy of his presentation that outlined the department's current staffing, challenges, solutions and costs. He spoke about the history of the department; in 2001 they created the positions of having two firefighters on duty and in 2007 the staffing number increased to four on each shift (24/7). During this same timeframe the call members were as follows: 2001=30, 2007=27, 2017=7. Mr. Viger questioned why the numbers had decreased. Deputy Leischner believed it was due to the present society with less people that lived/worked in Town, some may have become full-time firefighters. Chief Midgley said another problem was the training for call firefighters had increased to now adhere to State and Federal standards. He said people didn't have the time to commit to the amount of education and upkeep required. Mr. Viger understood it wasn't a matter of the department offerings, it was a matter of people not able to commit. Deputy showed a graph of the call department decline. He showed a chart representing a staffing comparison of surrounding communities based on population of 10,000 residents. He noted they didn't have enough firefighters on duty based on the number of population. Mr. Leonard wanted to know the staffing based on firehouses, since some of the surrounding communities had more than just a central station. Deputy Leischner said communities had different districts, therefore in his chart he used a ratio of population (10,000) rather than just looking at the number of firefighters within a community. Deputy Leischner showed a graph indicating the decline in the number of firefighters per call (per incident – 911 response). They were looking at the average number of people that show up for incidents. He showed a graph of the number of emergencies, per firefighter, as compared to other communities; Pelham was second only to Hudson.

Deputy Leischner provided information about simultaneous emergencies (multiple calls) during 2016, which totaled 33%. The triple simultaneous rate was 5%. He noted a department was at system failure at 42%. He said if mutual aid is called for an ambulance, Pelham loses revenue. In 2016 Pelham lost \$8,643 and the 2017 year-to-date total is \$8,643. Deputy Leischner said to address the situations, Pelham has used resource management using 1) Medical response determinants, 2) Reduced mutual

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/October 3, 2017

aid staffing, and 3) Single tanker driver. He said they have done everything they could, and compared to other communities were doing more, with less staffing.

Deputy Leischner then discussed their proposal to add a fifth firefighter per shift, which would give them the ability to have a dedicated engine company with three people and a dedicated ambulance. By adding a second company could in theory cover their emergencies 95% of the time (with the exception of two structure fires).

Mr. Viger understood from previous discussions that the upper command in the department was lacking, and wanted to know if the addition of staff would help with the 'hierarchy' or if they would be front line people. Chief Midgley knew there was a lack of command staff; the deputy was a stop-gap to fill the hole. However, he felt in the grand scheme of things it was more critical to get personnel on the trucks; paperwork and office issues could wait. He believed adding the fifth person would allow them to open up and respond to more of the uncaptured calls where mutual aid is responding. He said it would also allow the officer to be more of a command staff position, and in the future they could look at a restructure to benefit the Town and decrease costs.

Deputy Leischner discussed the importance of having additional firefighters on duty for different incidents. Chief Midgley said the proposal was to take steps to improve service within the community. He said there were many things they could be accomplish with an incident commander and two teams of two. Deputy Leischner told the Board about the Staffing for Adequate Fire & Emergency Response ('SAFER') grants program. The program was created to provide funding directly to fire departments to help them increase, or maintain firefighters to comply with staffing response and operational standards established by the NFPA. He summarized the percentage paid over three years based on the FY2016 year; the FY2017 was lower and may be harder to obtain. He worked with the Financial Director and stated a new firefighter/paramedic (including benefits) would cost just over \$92,000/year; four new firefighters/paramedics would cost \$369,000. Chief Midgley spoke about the required qualifications for a candidate to be hired. Mr. Viger wanted to know the exposure for overtime. Chief Midgley replied it would essentially be for work shifts. He believed there were enough EMT/firefighters that were looking for work and would be good candidates; however, ideally the end goal was to look for paramedics, but would accept an advanced EMT/Firefighter 2. Deputy Leischner noted the salary figure may be slightly less if the person isn't a paramedic, or they take a single plan instead of a family plan for medical coverage. He then reviewed the cost to the Town with the SAFER grant, which would be \$92,000 for four additional staff.

Chief Midgley asked that the Selectmen allow them to put forward a warrant article to accept a SAFER grant if awarded. He discussed the timeline and explained that the SAFER grant opened in November, but didn't go to panel until January/February. At the earliest they were looking at was the beginning of June for a determination of the grant, which would allow the voters to give their decision. If the voters turn the warrant article down the Chief could pull the grant.

Mr. Viger said his question went back to outsourcing dispatch. He said to make it work they would have needed four people at a cost of approximately \$400,000, which the voters may not have approved, so the decision was to go to Londonderry. He noted the Town couldn't go to Londonderry because they couldn't get their infrastructure to work. He wanted to know how the current proposal differed. Chief Midgley replied dispatch was a service that the department was able to achieve in another avenue and would be cost effective. He said he couldn't achieve 'boots on the ground' in another avenue. With regard to dispatch, he noted they were getting close, and it wasn't because of a lack of trying and would discuss the situation further during non-public as it dealt with contracts. He added the situation had nothing to do with the department, Londonderry or personnel; it was all infrastructure and the tower issue. Chief Midgley told the Board the department was seeing their numbers dwindle and they couldn't

345 get them up. He felt the time was right to bring the people on and believed it was an avenue that would
346 soften the blow to the taxpayer in a way that may be successful because they will see the person
347 delivering the services to the community.

348
349 With the understanding that there were people with tenure and dedication to the department, Mr. Viger
350 asked Chief Midgley if he would be willing to sacrifice the call department to get the four additional
351 positions. Chief Midgley replied he would be willing to look at doing so, but noted there were 4-5
352 people who had been with the department in excess of ten years that had delivered phenomenal service
353 to the community. He noted that a large percentage of the call department budget that would go. He
354 said they wouldn't fill any additional positions and believed the call department would die through
355 attrition, as had occurred in surrounding communities.

356
357 Mr. Leonard saw great information and stats, but didn't see a statistic for how many strike in the boxes
358 there were and how many times mutual aid has been called. He wanted to understand the information
359 for when there was no one in the fire house, because he didn't see the void just yet. Chief Midgley
360 replied the void was the mutual aid responses. He felt the data was more evident that on average they
361 are only getting one person per call, when in the past they were getting seven. He said they did
362 snapshots of statistical averages, but could provide detailed information on a call-by-call basis because
363 they record it for payroll. Mr. Leonard asked if 'mutual aid' was Pelham calling it in, or sending it out.
364 Chief Midgley said it was Pelham calling it in.

365
366 Mr. Lynde said he wouldn't support defunding call firefighters. He questioned if there had been a full-
367 blown recruiting process for call personnel, and wanted to know if there was any way to reach out to
368 get more applicants. Chief Midgley stated they had tried every avenue through working with the
369 academy, speaking to people in fire school and speaking at high schools. He said the problem was
370 people didn't have time in their lives anymore. He noted Pelham was the last call department in the
371 area. Mr. Lynde was concerned that firefighters didn't come in when called. Chief Midgley explained
372 their commitment to the Town was 42 hours. He said a person could only live the job for so much and
373 needed time outside of it. Deputy Leischner spoke to his experience that spanned over three decades.
374 He said people needed time off from their career. Chief Midgley pointed out that the department had
375 certain mandatory overtime that was filled.

376
377 Mr. Viger discussed the changes that had occurred in the department during the past four years. He
378 agreed that they needed an extra person, but wanted to know why this was the first time it was brought
379 to the Board. He said they spoke in June, but it wasn't part of the department's radar before now. He
380 questioned if the grant was making it important. Chief Midgley replied they had spoken about the
381 situation, and laid the foundation. He included it in his bi-weekly to inform they were headed in this
382 direction. He stated the grant was a major portion of why they wanted to do it. They were initially
383 very concerned it would be a sunset situation, with the grant ending in 2017; however, the President re-
384 authorized it, but the percentages weren't yet determined. Chief Midgley said they were doing it for
385 the people (in the Town), not for themselves; he said he didn't get anything from having a fire station,
386 or equipment that runs. He clarified by saying he didn't personally get those things. He stated that the
387 taxpayers had been fantastic to the Fire Department, and had no complaints about the support they had
388 given over the years. He said the things they ask for is to be able to deliver service to the community.

389
390 Mr. Viger was disappointed that the Chief said things didn't affect him. Ms. Spencer didn't see
391 anything wrong with people getting personal satisfaction from their jobs. She hoped that the Chief, the
392 Deputy and everyone got satisfaction from their jobs. She said it might be good for the Board to hear
393 that they did. Chief Midgley felt he was misrepresented and never said that he didn't get satisfaction
394 from being the Fire Chief. He said he didn't get something from the Town. When an ambulance is

replaced, it doesn't do something for him; he gets something from serving the community. He didn't understand how they got to this position (in the discussion).

If the Board gives support, Mr. Viger said he would like to get the request to the taxpayers. Mr. Leonard wanted the opportunity to digest the information provided and possibly have further discussion at the next meeting. He questioned if doing so would affect the department's ability to apply. Chief Midgley wasn't sure about the timeframe for warrant articles. Mr. McCarthy replied they had to be submitted by November 6th to the Budget Committee. Mr. Leonard wanted to err on the side of having the opportunity to review further. Ms. Spencer felt it would be important for a warrant article to be clear regarding the timing, breakdown and percentages of the grant, as well as when it would run out. Chief Midgley believed they would know the percentages by the beginning of November. Mr. McDevitt believed that they were required to let taxpayers know if there are obligations beyond one year. He took great pride in the fact that the Selectmen and department heads had good relationships. He hoped they could continue as they had for a long time.

Mr. Lynde assumed acceptance of the grant obliged the Town to maintain the firefighters after the grant ran out. Chief Midgley replied in the past it had been a provision, but it had been dropped when the grant was dropped from four years to three years.

Mr. McCarthy told the Board he would add an agenda item for next week's meeting; any questions should be forwarded to him. Ms. Spencer wanted to know the full exposure after the grant was paid off. She noted that information would need to be in the warrant article. Mr. McCarthy wanted to know what would happen if the warrant article went through, but the department didn't receive the grant. Mr. Lynde replied the grant would be subject to the warrant article being approved. Because time is of the essence, Mr. Viger suggested they begin working with Town Counsel to draft the warrant article.

Ms. Spencer wanted to know what the possible percentages would be. Chief Midgley said they would most likely be 75%, 75%, and 35%.

Mr. Viger asked if the Board agreed that the Fire Chief should go forward to work with Mr. McCarthy and Town Counsel to draft a warrant article. He said provided the Board's questions are answered at their next meeting the article could move forward. There were no objections.

OTHER BUSINESS

Discussion – Tree Maintenance Project

Mr. McDevitt reminded the Board they had a discussion a few months ago on the fact that there were 123+ landscape trees that the Town was responsible for, including those planted by the State during the roundabout project. Many of the trees were struggling and not doing well and clear they needed attention. He worked with Mr. McCarthy and got in touch with a group of certified arborists in the State. Mr. McCarthy said they did a telephone conference of three vendors and scheduled a date for a site walk. Although two vendors came for the site walk, only one vendor gave the Town a proposal; however, both indicated they couldn't do anything unless the trees were irrigated.

Mr. McDevitt said the proposal was for full maintenance for one year at \$26,000, which included irrigation. He said there may be alternatives for irrigation that they could consider, and suggested negotiating the cost for such out of the proposal. He believed the cost for clearing the sidewalks (around the roundabouts) was in the Town's landscaping contract, and could be pulled out since they were buying their own machine to do it. He said maybe they could dedicate some of that money from the landscape contract to watering the trees. He suggested they might be able to experiment with the use

irrigation bags for the trees. Mr. McDevitt wanted permission from the Board to speak to the vendor further regarding tree maintenance. There was no objection.

Discussion – Boiler Replacement Project / hiring consultant to write RFP and cost

Deferred to the next meeting.

Discussion – Changing Town Clerk and Treasurer to an appointed position

Deferred to the next meeting.

Discussion – Elderly Exemption warrant article

Mr. Lynde had done research to try to determine the potential tax impact. He provided the Board with a spreadsheet breakdown 'tier' system of surrounding towns. The information included the exemption values, income limits and asset limits. He used a 'value per population' to assist in compiling the data. He highlighted those towns that were comparable to Pelham. He explained how he determined the potential impact based on the proposed exemption amounts.

Mr. McDevitt noted Mr. McCarthy had drafted a warrant article based on numbers the Board had spoken about. He said he presented the numbers to the seniors and noted that the general feeling was that the numbers being presented were reasonable.

Discussion – Keno Law change / impact to New Hampshire towns

Mr. Lynde questioned if the warrant article would be submitted with, or without the Selectmen's recommendation. Mr. Viger replied the Selectmen would vote when they reviewed warrant articles. He said if the Board didn't approve it, the article wouldn't go forward. Mr. McDevitt noted the article could be submitted without a recommendation of the Board. He said it could be by petition. Mr. Lynde understood the article could be submitted without a recommendation. Mr. Viger answered yes.

Discussion – Sherburne Road water issue

Deferred to the next meeting.

Update / Vote – 2018 Planning Department Budget vote

Mr. McCarthy provided the Board with an updated figure for the Planning Department's budget. He explained during the Selectmen's discussion and vote the figures included an error that had now been corrected. Originally the Board had voted \$384,507; the new number has been confirmed as \$392,994.

MOTION: (Lynde/McDevitt) To approve \$392,994 as the Planning Board's (2018 budget) bottom line figure.

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

TOWN ADMINISTRATOR / SELECTMEN REPORTS

Mr. Lynde reported about the recent Planning Board meeting and summarized the proposed plans that were reviewed.

Mr. McCarthy informed that the new payroll software had gone 'live' earlier in the day and believed the transition from the previous software would be complete within two weeks. He then discussed how he had fielded complaints on social media with regard to the intersection of Mammoth Road/Keyes Hill Road/Tallant Road. He stated the Department of Transportation was out earlier in the day to do repairs. He asked that people contact him directly at BMcCarthy@pelhamweb.com rather than posting to social media, so situations can be addressed sooner. Mr. McDevitt stated discussion on social media was not considered contacting the Board of Selectmen.

Announcement – Music and Arts Festival – Saturday, October 7th at the Village Green. For more information contact Parks and Recreation. Those interested in having a vendor tent should call: 751-8459.

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 CALL: Mr. Viger-Yes; Mr. Lynde-Yes, Ms. Spencer-Yes; Mr. McDevitt-Yes; 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 9:21pm.

MOTION: (McDevitt/Leonard) To leave non-public session.

VOTE: The motion carried.

The Board returned to public session at approximately 9:45pm

Non-Public minutes were not sealed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:45pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary