

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

APPROVED
TOWN OF PELHAM
BOARD OF SELECTMEN - MEETING MINUTES
October 10, 2017
APPROVED – October 24, 2017

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CALL TO ORDER - approximately 6:30PM

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

ABSENT: Mr. Hal Lynde

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPOINTMENT(S)

Ed Gleason, Trustee of the Trust Funds: Review of a Trust Fund Policy

Mr. Gleason noted earlier in the year (May/June) he had a conversation with the Board regarding comments by the Charitable Trust Division of the Department of Justice ('DOJ'). He said the DOJ recommended that the Town institute a policy limiting acceptance of gifts for trust funds to \$10,000 or more. He stated that the administration of trust funds below that level wasn't worth it. A presentation was previously given to the Selectmen with the intent to determine whether or not the Town had current policies relative to accepting gifts. If not, the Trustees recommend that they institute one to address the issue. Mr. Gleason found that the DOJ had a recommended policy that could be used, and submitted such to Mr. McCarthy if the Board found it necessary to go forward with it as a warrant. He told the Board that the Trustees had gone through the existing list of Trust Funds and identified those that are inactive or of low dollar value. He said the act of closing them out has to be done at a Town Meeting. Going forward he recommended the Town institute a policy indicating they will not accept new trust funds under \$10,000.

Mr. Viger recalled the Board discussing the subject and recalled they were in agreement. He understood that a public hearing would be held for any gift over \$10,000, which could then be accepted at a subsequent meeting. Mr. Gleason believed the question was what to do with donations under \$10,000. He said having a document in place for donations would alleviate the task for his successors.

Ms. Spencer questioned what would happen to a fund if it began at \$10,000, but later fell below that amount. Mr. Gleason said the intent to expendable trust funds was to deplete the funds. A trust fund could remain as long as it started out at a minimum of \$10,000. The recommendation was to not create any new trust funds under a minimum of \$10,000. Donations could be accepted under \$10,000 to an existing trust fund, as long as the donator understood the provisions of the trust funds.

Mr. McDevitt wanted to know who would be the custodian if someone donated \$9,000. Mr. Gleason replied the Selectmen would be. He explained the Trustees of the Trust Funds were only responsible when a trust fund was established.

Mr. McDevitt made a motion to accept and establish trust funds from private funds in accordance with RSA 31:19 and the procedures outlined in the handout Mr. Gleason has given the Selectmen. Mr. Leonard seconded. Mr. Gleason believed the procedure had to go on the warrant. Mr. McDevitt questioned what RSA 31:19 required. Mr. Gleason referenced the DOJ guidelines that indicates voters

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/October 10, 2017

had to adopt a warrant article under specific procedures. He believed voters had to approve a policy for accepting gifts with it being mandatory to hold public hearings. Mr. McDevitt replied long ago the voters approved giving the Selectmen authority to accept gifts (after public hearing). He said he could find the warrant article. He thought the recommendation was to set a subparagraph to the existing authority making the minimum \$10,000 for a trust fund. Mr. Gleason believed if the Selectmen had an existing policy they could issue the proposal as an internal policy after a public hearing.

MOTION: (McDevitt/Leonard) To accept and establish trust funds from private funds in accordance with RSA 31:19 and the procedures outlined in the handout Mr. Gleason has given the Selectmen (*attached hereto*).

VOTE: (4-0-0) The motion carried.

Julie Chizmas of Nashua Regional Planning Commission, Steve Keach of Keach Nordstrom, and Planning Director Jeff Gowan - Sherburne Road / Mammoth Road Intersection

Ms. Chizmas opened discussion by speaking about the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality ('CMAQ') program, for which Pelham has submitted a letter of interest. She wanted to make sure everyone was aware of the program and the requirements before the Town formally submitted an application. She went through a power point presentation put together by the Department of Transportation ('DOT'). CMAQ is an 80/20 match; with a project cap of \$1.2 million in CMAQ dollars. Projects are scored on 1) Project readiness, 2) Financial readiness, 3) Sustainability, and 4) Air Quality benefits. Air Quality gives the highest number of points, with the second highest being sustainability. The application deadline is October 20, 2017 at 4pm. Ms. Chizmas discussed the items that were required to be included with the application.

Mr. McDevitt questioned if the Town had enough time to submit the application. Ms. Chizmas replied that the Town would need to put together a project estimate and spoke to the other required components. Mr. McCarthy wanted to know if having a warrant article pass in the spring would constitute a 'shovel ready' project making Pelham a qualified candidate to receive the grant. Ms. Chizmas answered yes and explained that they recognize that most of the towns don't have a capital reserve; this is how the point system is reviewed. Mr. Viger inquired what type of maintenance would be required of the Town since there were State roads involved. Ms. Chizmas spoke about the type of maintenance that would be performed by the State at the Sherburne/Mammoth intersection versus what action the Town would have to take at the Mammoth/Marsh intersection, since Marsh was a Town road.

Ms. Chizmas noted that the NRPC would assist with the air quality piece of the application. The DOT will be scheduling a meeting with the planning commissions and the Department of Environmental Services. She noted that portion of the application may not be due on October 20th since they don't have the information as of yet. The target date for awards is in December, although it may have to be extended because the whole CMAQ project has seen delays.

Mr. McDevitt asked what Pelham's anticipated contribution would be toward the project. Ms. Chizmas replied 20% for a project capping at \$1.5 million. It's an 80%/20% split. She reminded the Board that the Sherburne Road (only) intersection project was included in the State's 10-year plan for the year 2027. She noted if the Town waited for the State's 10-year project they wouldn't need to come up with matching funds.

Mr. Keach told the Board he was tasked with helping to populate the application with data concerning cost. He stated that NRPC had put together in the past two concepts for the two intersections

(Sherburne/Mammoth and Mammoth/Marsh); particularly the Sherburne intersection where there would be a roundabout or signalization. He noted that the length of construction on Sherburne would be longer for signals than it would be for a roundabout. He spoke about some of the other differences between the two types of project. He didn't feel there would be as much right-of-way acquisition cost in the signalized option as there would be with a roundabout. Mr. Keach said he would speak with Tom Severino of Severino Trucking, who had built several roundabouts for the State, to get a better estimate of costs. As he provides Mr. Gowan with data he didn't intend to be the low bidder and would build contingencies for reasonable cost projections. There are four parts to the estimate: 1) upfront design engineering, 2) right-of-way acquisition, 3) construction, and 4) inspection and construction administration. He believed the frontend cost for design and engineering would be similar for either method, he felt the right-of-way acquisition cost would be substantially more for the roundabout. Mr. Keach told the Board that he intended to assist Mr. Gowan in 'truthing' the numbers out by using the best of his ability and by speaking to those who have recent experience in building both types of projects. He reiterated he didn't intend to be the low bidder and would ensure that a contingency is built in that would be directly proportional to the uncertainty of the numbers.

Mr. Gowan stated if they were going to file a CMAQ application, they would need a vote by the Selectmen on their preferred alternative. The DOT would have to verify that they accept the selection. He said Mr. Keach would pull together cost numbers. They would also need a letter from the Selectmen indicating they will place a warrant article on the 2018 ballot for the full amount. Mr. Gowan noted that engineering and right-of-way acquisition costs were not refundable, but would count toward the Town's match. He noted there was an exaction fund for development around Sherburne Road that have (and continue to) contribute toward the project. He believed there was enough in the account to pay for the engineering. Mr. Keach noted they didn't have a lot of detailed information at this time; however, there was historical data for the area. He indicated that the design preference would affect the bottom line costs. He told the Board he didn't have a favorite approach, although he thought they were both good and had benefits.

Ms. Spencer understood that the Board should decide which alternative to support. She also understood that the funds needed for the engineering and design portion weren't reimbursable, but would count toward the 20% match. Mr. Gowan believed any money spent on the project (i.e. engineering, right-of-way acquisition) were counted toward the Town's match, but would not be refundable as part of the State's maximum.

Mr. Leonard wanted to know the timing for each of the projects. Ms. Chizmas explained they had an intersection improvement in the State's 10-year plan, which she didn't think specified signalization or roundabout. The funding wouldn't be available until 2027. She's heard roundabouts may take longer than signalization. She stated that the CMAQ money is available in the short term. Mr. McCarthy understood that the intersection could be done sooner with the CMAQ grant, rather than waiting until 2027. Ms. Chizmas stated that was correct. Mr. Keach discussed the possible timing in the event that the Town was awarded the grant. He believed the project could be staged for construction beginning in spring, 2019. He noted he had never seen a project on the State's 10-year plan that actually commenced in the tenth year. Mr. Leonard felt that the decision between the alternatives was a delicate balancing act. Mr. Keach replied Ms. Chizmas was expert at scoring. He noted it was an air quality program and anticipated the cost with the roundabout (x2) would be higher. Ms. Chizmas replied the 2009 data was based on peak hour delay.

Mr. McDevitt saw how successful the roundabouts were in the Town center. He called attention to the public survey conducted for the Master Plan, which listed 'smaller town atmosphere' as the highest score, another higher item was 'rural character'. He felt traffic signals would be a creeping urbanization that ran against the items listed in the survey. Given this, he felt the Selectmen should give serious

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/October 10, 2017

consideration to the roundabouts as a solution. He believed it was an investment well worth the cost and to have the Town continue to look like what most people value.

Ms. Spencer was torn. She agreed on a fundamental level, but was concerned about the impact the cost would have on the tax rate. She wished she had more time to make a decision. Mr. McDevitt replied they always have the opportunity to take the shortcut, but had never typically done that, which was why the fire station, library and village green looked as good as they do. They could have all been built less expensively. He felt it would be money well spent to consider putting the roundabouts in as opposed to traffic signals.

Mr. Viger believed the Board knew Mr. Lynde was in favor of the roundabouts, and was asked to mention his input.

Mr. McDevitt made a motion to recommend roundabouts for Mammoth/Marsh and Sherburne/Mammoth as a solution to the traffic problems.

MOTION: (McDevitt/Viger) To recommend roundabouts for Mammoth/Marsh Roads and Sherburne/Mammoth Roads as a solution to the traffic problems.

VOTE: (2-2-0) The motion failed.

Mr. Viger questioned if the Board wanted to make a motion for traffic lights. Mr. McDevitt answered no. He said he would have for procedural purposes, but in his opinion it wasn't the right conclusion.

Mr. Viger inquired if the grant ended this year or if there might be a chance next year. Mr. Gowan replied he had asked the question and understood the next round may come back in two years; however, the last time it was supposed to take two years it actually took five years. Mr. Viger understood there was no guarantee to grant monies. Mr. Gowan clarified that it wasn't actually a grant, but rather a 'round' of funding. He stated if they didn't get the application together in time for this round, there would be another round either two or five years out. If the Board didn't make a decision, he encouraged them to keep pushing forward to be ready in the future. Mr. Viger asked if there was an opportunity, similar to the Willow Street project, if the Town raised a portion of the money that the intersection project would move up on the State's list. Mr. Gowan didn't have an answer.

Mr. Keach told the Board that part of the project development was the study phase. He said they were currently a bit starved for information to properly judge an alternatives analysis; however it comes out as a byproduct of the study phase. He said it could very well be if the Town was awarded CMAQ funds that the study phase data may reveal that the choice they were forced to make may cause the Town to revisit it. He said as long as the Town was delivering a project with the same function, they may have the ability to revisit the options. He was less concerned with which choice because it was really a trial, not a final decision.

Mr. Leonard commented that ultimately the voters would decide. His fear was having a stalemate situation and not rectifying the problem. He knew if Mr. Lynde was present that the vote would be done. As a practical matter, Mr. McDevitt said the votes were there and said if there was urgency, possibly the Board could wait a day and have another meeting. He wanted to know if they chose roundabouts, and then found that traffic signals were compelling, if they could still change projects. Mr. Keach replied it would come out in the study phase.

The Board continued their discussion. Mr. McDevitt questioned what vote would satisfy the application due October 20th. Ms. Chizmas replied the Board would have to decide an option. Mr. McCarthy said

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/October 10, 2017

the Board could hold a meeting prior to October 20th and review what data Mr. Keach had put together. Mr. Viger didn't think it would be fair to conduct another meeting just to have a different Board member present that would change the vote. He saw both sides, but if the Board that's present didn't pass an alternative, he would like them to keep discussing the matter until they came up with a vote that passed. Mr. McDevitt noted that the Board had a strong history of delaying votes when a member had strong feelings and couldn't be present. He was unsure if they had the ability to delay and appealed to his colleagues to consider, for the interim, to support the additional amount of money for the roundabouts. He said doing so would 'kick off' the process, so they didn't have to explain to voters why something wouldn't be done until 2027.

Mr. Leonard stated he was amenable to Mr. McDevitt's process of getting the ball started. He felt doing so was important. Ms. Spencer also agreed. Mr. McCarthy confirmed the Town had the ability to change options. Ms. Chizmas believed they could if there was compelling data. She noted the roads were State roads and the State would want to put in the right improvement. If through the design phase they came to find out that a roundabout wasn't the better option, she didn't feel that they wouldn't allow the alternative option.

With the Board having reached a consensus, Mr. McDevitt made the following motion:

MOTION: (McDevitt/Leonard) To take the steps necessary to apply for a Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program Grant to solve by roundabouts the traffic problems at the intersection Sherburne Road/Mammoth Road and Mammoth Road/Marsh Road.

VOTE: (4-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. McDevitt thanked his colleagues. He said it showed the voters that the Board can work together toward a solution so they don't have to wait until 2027. The Board thanked Ms. Chizmas, Mr. Keach and Mr. Gowan for presenting the information.

Mr. Gowan stated that they would need a letter from the Board of Selectmen signifying their support and indicating they intend to place a warrant article on the 2018 ballot for all of the funding. Mr. McCarthy noted warrant articles had to go to the Budget Committee by November 6th.

Fire Chief James Midgley and Deputy Chief Paul Leischner – Follow Up on the Safer Grant and associated warrant article

Chief Midgley stated during their meeting last week with the Board there were members that had some questions on some of the material that had been presented. He stated he was not able to obtain a definitive answer from FEMA regarding what the percentages would be. The likely event is that the percentage would stay the same (this year) because this is the last year for when the grant was supposed to sunset. There has been discussion at the Federal level in light of the hurricanes that they may revoke all funding opportunities. At this time, the Safer Grant was due to open in November/December and if anything changes the Board will be notified. Chief Midgley noted that he was asked for information regarding how many times the department struck the box. He explained that is a subjective action based on the actions of the officer. The average is approximately two times with nobody in the station. He said there was no way to get a definitive answer. He said the Board questioned how many times the station wasn't manned by call firefighters. He provided 'snapshot' data from January, March, May, July, August and September to show the number of calls, responses with call members, percentage (based on call volume), and calls with only off duty firefighters (came back to staff station). He noted the most telling information was the responses with call members, which showed the numbers

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/October 10, 2017

dwindling. By going through the data, Chief Midgley told the Board he was able to identify the holes in the shifts.

Mr. McDevitt questioned if it was possible to add one firefighter for peak times. Chief Midgley replied there were things out of his control, such as the union contract stipulating what the shifts will be; although they could sit down and try to discuss filling holes in the shifts and backfilling over a longer period of time. He said the downside would be the department repetitively applying for the Federal grant to seek people. Also, the grant system is in place to fill holes, and they have to do an analysis of the department (response time and personnel) so those holes are filled when funded. Mr. McDevitt questioned if the grant compelled them to look for full staffing. Chief Midgley answered yes. Mr. Viger understood if they tried to seek two firefighters, instead of four, that the department would automatically disqualify itself because they wouldn't be meeting the criteria for the grant guidelines. Chief Midgley replied it would put them in an uphill battle. He said they could apply, but felt it would be a lesser success probability.

Mr. McCarthy noted that the warrant articles were due to Budget Committee November 6th.

Mr. Viger said he was weighing the impact and didn't doubt that the department had the need. Mr. McDevitt wanted to know when the department would have requested additional staffing if the grant hadn't been available. Chief Midgley replied he would have made the request during the next budget season. He said it made them nervous when they learned that the grant may sunset this year, which is why they pushed the request up a year. Mr. Viger asked how many firefighters they would have requested in the next budget season. Chief Midgley replied they would have discussed their goals and probably requested two and then the next year requested another two. Mr. Viger understood they would have been up to four additional staff within three years.

Mr. McDevitt felt they may be better off to pass on the grant, and have the Chief, Mr. McCarthy and the union representative discuss what's involved with changing the contract. He didn't think there would be a strong objection to having additional staff. He said it might be easier for the voters to accept one or two firefighters and then have them come back later for an additional two.

For the reasons stated by Mr. McDevitt and given the fact that they wouldn't know the percentages, Ms. Spencer agreed. Mr. Viger was torn, given that they would get to the same point in four years and not have to pay for it. Mr. Leonard questioned if the Board had enough data to make a decision. In reviewing the data provided, he questioned what the call numbers would look like in three years. Chief Midgley replied the number of calls would continue to climb; it's been on an upward trend every year. Mr. McDevitt stated that the Town couldn't tolerate degradation of response time. He asked if there was a deadline for the grant. Chief Midgley replied that the grant wasn't going to open until November/December. Mr. McDevitt suggested that the Chief speak to the Planning Department about the development (currently being built, and those in the review process) within Town, because it would be helpful going forward. He believed knowing future population would be helpful. Ms. Spencer stated that the Board had a lot of difficult decisions to make, and concerned about the taxpayers.

Mr. Viger asked the Board if they wanted additional data from the Chief. Mr. McDevitt felt it would be useful to see response times. Chief Midgley asked the Board if they wanted any other data points to let him know.

OTHER BUSINESS

Review of draft 2018 Warrant Articles

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/October 10, 2017

The Board reviewed the initial list of proposed warrant articles for the 2018 ballot (*specific wording to be fine tuned at a later time*).

- A. \$300,000 to be placed in the previously established Highway Maintenance Capital Reserve Fund – for a highway maintenance facility.

Mr. McDevitt suggested possibly cutting the amount to \$150,000. Mr. McCarthy stated the fund currently contained \$100,000. He noted they were going into year three of a five year lease for the current trailer. He was trying to speed the process to get the building moved forward and get out of the trailer within that five years. At the end of the five years they will have to do another 5-year lease. He noted that the intention was to be out of the trailer within the lease period. He was trying to get the funding so the committee could work on getting cost estimates for site work and building. He believed the construction would cost close to \$700,000.

- B. \$300,000 to be placed in a Municipal Building heating system capital reserve fund to replace the existing heating system. (boiler replacement project)

Mr. McDevitt questioned if it failed inspection. Mr. McCarthy replied they had failed on a couple things, but had them repaired. He stated they were expending 50 gallons of oil an hour when the boiler is up and running. With the gas line coming (within 6 months), he wanted to try to get the project going and hook up to the gas so the boilers could be dismantled. He pointed out that the heating system wasn't upgraded from when the building was a school.

Ms. Spencer felt the proposed amount sounded like a lot of money and wanted to know what it entailed. Mr. Viger explained that the boilers were big and were an old system. He noted the total cost to replace the heating system would be approximately \$1 million. Ms. Spencer questioned if the building was being replaced. Mr. Viger answered no; they were proposing to replace the heating system within the Municipal Building. Mr. McCarthy said a gentleman came in and gave a starting point cost estimate of half a million dollars and noted it could go higher. He said he needed to hire an engineering company to go through the building so he could have a fine tuned estimate. He was trying to put money aside so they could begin getting the problem resolved. Mr. McDevitt asked if the intent was to put money together for engineering. Mr. Viger replied his intent was to spend out of this year's budget, if there was surplus near the end of the year.

- C. Police contract – placeholder, not yet ratified.

- D. Sell Town owned property – placeholder.

Mr. McDevitt said it might be better to consider an easement. Mr. McCarthy believed Town Counsel advised it wasn't a viable option; however, he planned to revisit the discussion with him. Mr. McDevitt understood there were several homes that abutted the Senior Center parking lot and suspected a number of them would have the same issue.

- E. Highway Block Grant - \$321,583.

- F. To change the office of Town Treasurer from elected to appointed position.

Mr. Viger noted it was more difficult to fill elected position seats and the Treasure position was a crucial position within the Town's infrastructure. Mr. McCarthy stated anyone could apply for the job. Mr. McDevitt stated they weren't trying to get rid of the current Treasurer. Mr. McCarthy pointed out that Town Counsel had provided comment. Mr. Viger said they had extensive conversations with the current Treasurer and she was in complete agreement and felt it was the way the Town should move forward. He said they were looking to do the same thing with the Town Clerk/Tax Collector, but learned that position has to be elected.

- G. Elderly Exemption amendment.

Mr. Viger read the proposal aloud. Mr. McDevitt believed they could consider the numbers final; they were reviewed a couple months ago by a group of seniors. In general the numbers were supported. Ms. Spencer recalled that the proposed numbers put Pelham in the middle of the communities they reviewed.

H. Discontinue Capital Reserve Funds.

Mr. Viger reviewed the list of funds that were being proposed to close.

I. \$1.5 million to purchase land and easements for conservation purposes, with \$12,000 for the first year's interest/costs.

Mr. Viger explained that years ago the Town authorized \$3 million to purchase land and were seeking to do the same with the proposed article. Mr. McDevitt knew that the Conservation Commission was about to hit the 1,000 acre mark, but was unsure if all of it was purchased using the fund. Mr. Viger noted they were going to raise the money and then float a bond to purchase the land. Mr. McDevitt pointed out that they borrow the money as its needed; they pay principal and interest based on the bond rate at the time. Mr. Leonard spoke about the difficult decisions the Board would have to make when reviewing which articles to put forward to the taxpayers.

J. Forestry Committee - \$36,300 from the forestry fund for maintenance.

K. Keno article.

Ms. Spencer questioned if the Board had any sense if people were in favor of adding Keno. Mr. Viger answered no. He commented that the State had approved it and they would find out how people felt if they chose to put the article forward. He questioned if the Town had any jurisdiction over who would be allowed to have it. Mr. McCarthy believed if the Town didn't vote, they couldn't regulate it. He believed the purpose of voting was to give them the opportunity to regulate it. Mr. McDevitt understood if the article didn't pass, Keno couldn't be played in the Town. He believed it was regulated by the State because it was gambling. He said there were some stores along Route 38 that could benefit from having it.

Mr. McCarthy asked that Board members contact him with any questions or suggestions since there was only one Board meeting prior to when articles are due for submission to the Budget Committee (November 6th). He noted that the proposed articles had been submitted and vetted through legal. Ms. Spencer pointed out that the articles for the fire station staff and the roundabout (Sherburne/Mammoth/Marsh) weren't yet included. Mr. Viger asked Mr. McCarthy to task the Fire Chief with writing his warrant article.

Given that the Board had to vote regarding the warrant articles at their next meeting, Ms. Spencer commented this year there was a lot more indecision than they usually have. She questioned if they needed to schedule another meeting to discuss some of the numbers more. Mr. Viger replied there were only two that he believed they needed to discuss further. Ms. Spencer was concerned with the Highway Building, Municipal Building boiler, Fire Department staff and the Roundabouts because they were high ticket items. Mr. Viger replied the roundabouts and the fire staff weren't yet before them, but was open to further discussion on the other two items.

Mr. Viger commented that the capital reserve for the boiler was \$300,000 and the absolute minimum needed for the project was \$500,000 and up to approximately \$1 million. He said they won't know where they need to be until they have engineering. Mr. McDevitt asked what implications there would be to take it from the fund balance. Mr. McCarthy said it was on his radar, but he would feel comfortable with the proposed number to get things started so he could have an engineer provide a defined figure. He said if they could expend money out of the fund balance the article could be struck during reconsideration. Mr. McDevitt said part of the role was to try to figure out what had a reasonable

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/October 10, 2017

chance of passage. He was concerned with the article having a big number and felt they might be better off to take it out from the fund balance, which still needed voter approval. He said doing so might give other things a better chance to pass. Mr. Viger said they could draft the article to expend from the fund balance rather than create a capital reserve.

Mr. McDevitt asked how much was currently in the fund balance. Mr. McCarthy replied there was \$5.5 million. Mr. Viger had hoped to get a replacement value sooner than now so the entire number could have been proposed out of the fund balance, but the contractor hadn't worked out. Mr. McDevitt said if they could take the money out of this year's budget to pay for the consultant, and get a number fairly quickly, they might be able to amend the number to take it all out of the fund. Mr. McCarthy will change the article to have it take \$300,000 out of the fund balance.

Mr. Viger suggesting voting on a not-to-exceed number of \$14,500 for engineering, based on initial quotes received. There was no objection.

MOTION: (Leonard/Spencer) To expend, and not exceed, \$14,500 for the purpose of engineering fees for boiler replacement.

VOTE: (4-0-0) The motion carried.

The Board then discussed the proposed highway building. Ms. Spencer said due to unfortunate health related circumstances the committee had not been able to meeting. She said they previously had very rough numbers, but didn't have them with her. She noted it would be a costly endeavor. Mr. Viger commented that the fund currently had \$100,000. Mr. Leonard said as the project progresses, it might be able to be done in a phased approach. Mr. Viger believed the Budget Committee would be more apt to supporting warrant articles that have architectural and engineering plans done before hand. He said the question was whether to keep it at the proposed \$300,000 or reduce it to \$150,000. Ms. Spencer told the Board she would bring her preliminary notes to the next meeting that were from the committee meeting they held months ago.

Discussion – Changing Treasurer to an appointed position

Mr. Viger noted during warrant article review the Board had a brief discussion regarding the Treasurer position. There were no additional questions.

Discussion - Sherburne Road water issue

Mr. McDevitt received an inquiry from a resident asking what was being done. He summarized the status and commented they were running out of options and had no immediate solution. He believed the Board was aware they were waiting for the McCarthy subdivision (at the southwest corner of Sherburne Road/Mammoth Road) because there were two wells that might be useful. The capacity of the wells could be approximately 50-60 homes. Pennichuck was approached to find out the cost of bringing water to the top of Sherburne Road; however they weren't responding. Mr. McDevitt feared no matter what the number was, it would be high. He commented that the wells would be the Town's, but needed a lot of infrastructure. He believed they were getting close to exhausting all solutions and said at some point soon the Board may need to send a letter to the 200+ residents in the area and let them know the status. Mr. McDevitt commented there were a couple houses that had terrible water problems. He spoke to the Assessor and 3rd party Assessor and questioned what would happen if someone applied for a tax abatement. He said one person in the area applied and was granted an abatement, after providing significant data to the Assessor. He felt if it turns out that the Town exhausts

all possibilities, they should let those people with serious water problems know that applying for an abatement may be helpful.

Mr. McDevitt said there was one thin possibility being pursued, and he will update the Board within the next month. He noted it would also involve infrastructure, pipes and a pump station. He wanted residents to know the Board hadn't forgotten about the situation.

Discussion – Use of exaction fees for the Sherburne Road / Mammoth Road intersection

Mr. Viger believed earlier in the meeting the Board had covered the discussion about using the exaction fees. Mr. McCarthy questioned if the Board had to vote to utilize the money for an early engineering study. Mr. Viger replied they didn't know what the amount was. Mr. McCarthy noted the fees could be used for engineering, design etc. Mr. McDevitt believed the Selectmen had to vote regarding the use of the fees, not the voters. Mr. Viger suggesting getting a not-to-exceed number from Keach Nordstrom.

Mr. McDevitt commented there was a State Law regarding transportation projects that allowed a town meeting vote to add an additional \$5 fee to automobile registrations. He believed it would cover such things like the improvements to Sherburne/Mammoth intersection. Given the number of current automobile registrations, they could possibly raise close to \$100,000 per year, if the voters agreed to do so. He asked the Board to consider including a warrant article that contained an end date. Ms. Spencer felt the suggestion was an interesting way to defray the cost of the intersection. Mr. McDevitt will provide the Board with a copy of the RSA.

MINUTES REVIEW

October 3, 2017

MOTION: (Leonard/McDevitt) To approve the October 3, 2017 meeting minutes as amended.

VOTE: (4-0-0) The motion carried.

OPEN FORUM

No one came forward.

TOWN ADMINISTRATOR / SELECTMEN REPORTS

The Selectmen had no reports.

REQUEST FOR NON-PUBLIC SESSION

MOTION: (Leonard/Spencer) Request for a non-public session per RSA 91-A:3,II,a (Personnel)

ROLL CALL: Mr. Viger-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.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/October 10, 2017

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

VOTE: The motion carried.

478

479 The Board returned to public session at approximately 9:33pm

480

481 Non-Public minutes were not sealed.

482

483 **ADJOURNMENT**

484

485 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:33pm.

486

487

Respectfully submitted,

488

Charity A. Landry

489

Recording Secretary

490