

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

**APPROVED
TOWN OF PELHAM
BOARD OF SELECTMEN - MEETING MINUTES
November 10, 2020**

8
9
10
11
12
13

CALL TO ORDER – Mr. Haverty called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00PM

PRESENT: Robert Haverty, Heather Forde, Hal Lynde, Jaie Bergeron, Kevin Cote

ABSENT: Town Administrator Brian McCarthy

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MINUTES REVIEW:

October 27, 2020:

MOTION: (Forde/Cote) To approve the October 27, 2020 meeting minutes as written.

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

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

ANNOUNCEMENT(S)

Mr. Haverty congratulated Pelham’s new State Representatives, Hershel Nunez, and Denise Smith. He thanked all the volunteers and employees who worked during the recent election.

OPEN FORUM

No one came forward.

APPOINTMENT(S)

Fire Chief James Midgley and Health Officer Karen McGlynn – Pandemic Update

Ms. McGlynn informed the number of positive Covid cases in New Hampshire was currently 2,057. In total there have been 12,699 people infected in the State. In Pelham there were currently 36-40 infections in the community. Hillsborough County is leading in the State with the most positive cases collectively. She said almost all the positives that have come across her desk have been from not wearing a mask. She discussed what they currently knew about the virus and the associated after affects. She spoke about masks being a source control and discussed how to wear a mask correctly. She was unsure at present whether Pelham needed a mask mandate; however, if the numbers kept increasing, she felt it should be discussed. She asked that everyone in the community continue to wear a mask. Ms. McGlynn talked about a vaccine and mentioned that initially there would only be twenty-five million doses available (worldwide). The initial rollout will cover health care professionals, first responders and possibly assisted living. It needs two doses to be effective. There may not be widespread use of the vaccine until spring or summer (2021), which was another good reason she believed people should continue to wear a mask.

Mr. Bergeron asked about restaurants and wanted to know if cooks were required to wear masks while cooking. Ms. McGlynn answered no; the people serving the public had to unless cooks were within the service area. The virus is fragile; if it hits heat it will not survive.

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95

Mr. Haverty understood people could become reinfected at the 4-6-month mark. He asked how often people would need to be vaccinated. Ms. McGlynn replied the studies were ongoing. She said people test at 40 days and 80 days; an independent company conducts the trials/tests. At 80 days there was no change from the 40-day mark. They will continue to monitor and see if the immunity holds. Mr. Haverty understood education and mask mandate were two overarching components. He agreed the Town was not at the point of enforcing a mandate but felt they could improve education. Ms. McGlynn discussed the areas that were ‘super spreaders’ and explained that was the reason for telling people to not only social distance but also wear a mask.

Mr. Cote understood the second wave was missed and it should now be the third wave; however, the numbers were appearing higher than predicted. He questioned at what stage things should shut down. He said it seemed the numbers were higher now than they were when things were shut down. Ms. McGlynn replied when they completely shut down, they didn’t have the information (they now had) about the virus. She said they didn’t know it could be controlled, which is the reason a lot of places are mandating masks. She said it wasn’t good for the economy to shut down. It was a better idea to stay open and control the virus. She said the numbers were high because people were tired of the virus and becoming lacks on wearing a mask.

Mr. Lynde asked if the Town could have a mask mandate and questioned who would enforce it. Ms. McGlynn replied there were different types of mandates and said she was leaning toward a ‘no fine’ mandate. She didn’t think having fines was the answer but felt if numbers continued to increase, they had to do something.

Mr. Bergeron questioned if Ms. McGlynn had reviewed the numbers from towns with mandates. Ms. McGlynn spoke about the Town of Berlin, which was in the process of passing theirs. She said they had twenty-five but didn’t want it to get to the same numbers as Pelham. Their population is 10,000. Mr. Bergeron believed people in Town were wearing masks for the most part and felt if people were forced; they may be more likely not to wear one. Mr. Bergeron said he would support education and signage with the hope that people did a better job.

Chief Midgley stated there has been a significant change across the country from when he spoke to the Board two weeks ago. He said on the colored map, states that were yellow were now orange, every state was at either pre-explosion or the rates have already exploded. Of the six New England states, four were already red. With regard to a mask mandate, Chief Midgley discussed the mid-west/central states. He said three of those states have mask mandates, but it had not slowed their growth rate and continued to grow rapidly. In Pelham, he felt it would be a problem if people were told they had to wear a mask. He said the people that would be captured with a mask mandate were already wearing them. Chief Midgley spoke about the vaccine. He participated in a federal partners vaccine program for the State of New Hampshire meeting. He said it would be an extreme logistical nightmare to get the vaccines out due to the nature of shipment and delivery. He stated the top three companies were Pfizer, Moderna and Johnson & Johnson. He said they were trying to make plans on what they think is going to happen, but they don’t have all the information yet.

Agriculture Commission applicant interview: Laura Spottiswood

Ms. Spottiswood came forward. Mr. Haverty read aloud a letter submitted by the Chair of the Agriculture Commission recommending the appointment of Ms. Spottiswood to a full-time seat. He recalled when the Board was interviewing applicants, Ms. Spottiswood stood out as a person who understood the position. He asked why she was looking to switch from an alternate member to full-time. Ms. Spottiswood replied she had personal commitments that were winding down. Also, she

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/November 10, 2020

96 found she loved working with the commission members. Now that there was an open position, she
97 would like to be considered for full-time.
98

MOTION: (Lynde/Cote) To appointed Laura Spottiswood to the remaining term of the vacant
two-year position on the Agricultural Commission.

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

99

100 **PUBLIC HEARING – To receive resident feedback regarding a potential Campbell Grove road**
101 **improvement project.**

102

103 Mr. Haverty explained the matter at hand was the Town (Selectmen) made a determination that plowing
104 of private roads would not be done by the Town any further. He said the Board was trying to understand
105 from the residents of the Campbell Grove area if it would be of interest to the residents to work with
106 the Town to improve the roads and bring them up to Town standard so the Town could move forward
107 and maintain those roads. He stated they could not spend taxpayer money on private roads to do
108 engineering work to get to a cost, they could only use numbers based off previous estimates plus
109 inflation. At present those estimated costs were in the area of \$1.3 million and \$1.5 million to bring
110 the roads up to Town standard. The cost would be borne by the residents of the neighborhood on a 10-
111 year bond that would be serviced equally by the residents over the ten-year period. There are
112 approximately forty parcels that would be affected.

113

114 Mr. Ray Gladu, 9 Campbell Road came forward and told the Board the residents were interested in
115 hearing the costs. He said in 2004 the same question was on the Town ballot and passed but didn't go
116 anywhere. He wanted to know if anyone knew why. Mr. Haverty replied the cost (amount of money)
117 on the ballot would not have serviced the project. There was no money collected or expended. Mr.
118 Gladu wanted to know if it would take 100% participation of the homeowners to buy in. Mr. Haverty
119 believed the RSA states there has to be a majority approval (of those affected); Town Counsel advised
120 there should be a significant majority of the people affected. Personally, he would be reticent to do
121 anything without all the residents being in favor of it. Mr. Gladu did not want to increase someone's
122 property taxes that would force them to leave. Mr. Haverty said the Town was looking for feedback to
123 know if it were something the residents would be interested in. Mr. Gladu inquired if the bond could
124 go twenty years. Mr. Haverty answered no; the RSA says it would have to be a ten-year bond. He
125 explained the payment (of the bond) did not stay with the property; the payment stayed with the property
126 owner. There would be a lien on properties the owner was required to satisfy before a house could be
127 sold.

128

129 Mr. Gladu mentioned the existing road width and questioned if anyone would lose property. It was
130 suggested by Ms. Forde they might be able to review a similar road width as a conservation subdivision.
131 Mr. Lynde believed there may be some roads that do not have the width without taking property. Mr.
132 Haverty noted they would have to look at it, but that would take engineering which they could not spend
133 tax dollars doing.

134

135 Mr. Don Chelton, 22 Campbell Road asked if the interest cost to the bond would also be assessed to
136 the homeowners. Mr. Lynde answered yes. Mr. Chelton wanted to know the typical life of a bond
137 payment and was curious why ten years was mentioned. Mr. Lynde replied the requirements were
138 contained in the State Statutes; they were obligated to limit to ten years. The associated Statute is
139 NHRSA 231:28 – 31. Mr. Chelton questioned if the Town would collect the assessment for each
140 individual property. Mr. Haverty said it was a 'betterment' with the taxes. Mr. Chelton wanted to
141 know what limits of the roadway were included in the estimate. Mr. Haverty replied there was a portion
142 of Campbell Road from Dutton Road measuring approximately 750ft. that was at one point improved,

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/November 10, 2020

143 but that portion was never accepted by vote of the Town and remained a private road. He said the
144 estimate was a best guess estimate based on inflation. Mr. Chelton understood the number could
145 increase or decrease. He wanted to know if others living in Town were assessed for road improvements.
146 Mr. Haverty said if it were a private road to make it a Town road it would follow the same procedure.
147 He said if it were a public road already accepted by the Town, it would be paid for by tax dollars.
148 Absent a road being accepted by the Town there was no authority to spend tax dollars on it. Mr. Chelton
149 stated he owned property in that area for over seventy years. During that time, the roads have been
150 plowed and the upper reaches of Campbell Road have been maintained by the Town. He said there
151 was a court case in 2007 that addressed the specific issue of private versus public roads; the courts
152 decided there did not have to be a formal mechanism of a Town vote or for dedication of acceptance of
153 a street. Mr. Haverty spoke about the finding, which stated the simple clearing of snow did not
154 constitute sufficient maintenance to the road so as to imply the Town has accepted the road. He said it
155 went on to say if a Town had not maintained a road for a period of five years, the road becomes a Class
156 VI unmaintained road. Mr. Haverty stated they had gone back through records and found no place
157 where any portion of the road was accepted by Town Meeting vote. Mr. Chelton stated the case
158 specifically cited removing snow as an implied acceptance. He said it also spoke to police patrol as
159 taking action to imply acceptance.

160
161 Mr. Haverty commented he had a meeting with Town Counsel 3-4 hours before the meeting regarding
162 that stretch of road and the fact the Town had at one point crack sealed and removed snow from the
163 road. He said Town Counsel has reiterated the same point over and over again that the removal of
164 snow in and of itself does not constitute acceptance. Town Counsel had also said crack sealing one
165 time more than five years ago also does not constitute maintaining the road. They did not see that
166 section as an implied or accepted Town road.

167
168 Mr. Chelton asked if the same policy of no plowing was being applied universally throughout the Town.
169 Mr. Haverty stated that was correct. Mr. Chelton suggested the Town revisit the court ruling with Town
170 Counsel. Mr. Haverty replied he would get the ruling and provide the language to Mr. Gladu.

171
172 Mr. Gladu stated he has lived on Campbell Road for eight years. He said four years ago the Town
173 sealed the cracks on the top portion of Campbell Road. He said every year he lived there the Town has
174 removed the brush and sweep the road, not just plowed. In preparation for the meeting, Mr. Haverty
175 drove down Campbell Road earlier in the day. He said he knew where the 750ft. mark was because the
176 road turns into a dirt road; it is clear there is some section of the road that has been improved. He asked
177 that the maintenance records be reviewed and learned that the Highway Agent (told the Town
178 Administrator) the last time the road was crack sealed was well over five years ago. He said they were
179 trying to determine the ownership for the first 750ft of road. Mr. Gladu wanted it recognized that the
180 Town had done more than just plow the first portion (750ft). Mr. Haverty said it was evident by
181 looking at the road that it had been improved, crack sealed and maintained; it was just a question as to
182 when it stopped. Mr. Gladu wanted to know how they could get (at a minimum) that portion maintained
183 by the Town. Mr. Haverty stated he was working through it now.

184
185 Mr. George LaBonte, 5 Gaston Street provided the Board with a summary of the history for the first
186 portion of the street. He told the Board he came in front of them in the 1990s when the issue about the
187 first portion of Campbell Road first came up. He said it was found there was acceptance of the road
188 via plans from when the log cabin was built because it needed 200ft. of frontage on a Town road. He
189 added the Town has also accepted the road via the Board of Selectmen; the road was ripped up, repaved,
190 and brought up to Town standards and later crack sealed and taken care of it. Mr. LaBonte wanted to
191 know how the Town was now looking at it and saying it was not an accepted road when during all these
192 years they have treated as such. He questioned what would happen to other roads in Town after five
193 years.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/November 10, 2020

194

195 Mr. Haverty explained if a road is not maintained for five years they become (or have an ability to
196 become) an ‘unmaintained’ Town road as opposed to being private. He stated they could find no record
197 of any public meeting (either Town meeting or Board of Selectmen) that accepted the road by formal
198 vote. They started looking to find out how much of the road the Town would not be plowing because
199 someone raised a question regarding how many feet were Town owned. Mr. Haverty agreed up until
200 this past winter the Town was plowing that portion of the road using taxpayer dollars. He said there is
201 a disconnect someplace and was continuing to find out how to solve that problem.

202

203 Mr. LaBonte told the Board he was going through his files and found an old file with discussions and
204 hearings (from the 1990s); Mr. Lynde was present for them. He offered to pull the file and share them
205 with the Selectmen. Mr. Haverty said the Board would welcome the notes/minutes. He mentioned that
206 he had spent a lot of his own time trying to figure out where the situation went sideways and how best
207 to solve the problem. He would welcome working with Mr. LaBonte. Mr. LaBonte said he would be
208 more than happy to share the file. He wondered if the Selectmen had thought about making some of
209 the roads emergency ways because under the statutes, they have the ability to do so. Mr. Haverty
210 replied through his conversation with Town Counsel and learned there were certain considerations. He
211 said a public safety issue would have to be proven that went beyond servicing the abutters. Mr. LaBonte
212 noted there were approximately thirty-three residents in the area and quite a few were elderly. Mr.
213 Haverty said nature of the conversation (with Town Counsel) was that there would need to be a public
214 building the Town needed access to, which would require them to make sure the road is plowed. Mr.
215 LaBonte replied there was nothing stating this in the statute, and he was not aware of any case law
216 requiring it. He said the Board had the ability to start and stop taking care of the roads as an emergency
217 way.

218

219 Ms. Forde noted creating an ‘emergency lane’ might not guarantee plowing at a level the residents
220 considered ‘passable’. She said an emergency lane is maintained exclusively for access to a specific
221 facility. Mr. LaBonte understood. He said a lot of residents own a plow. He added when the Town
222 plows it’s basically a one-lane pass through; after which the residents go back through and widen the
223 roads. Mr. Haverty said he was exploring different options. He will look for the language describing
224 emergency ways and send it back through Mr. Gladu.

225

226 Mr. Lynde believed they had discussed the progression for how they got to the present. He said early
227 on they allowed the plowing and then realized they couldn’t spend Town money to do so. Therefore,
228 they were going to have the residents of the roads pay for it but found out they shouldn’t be doing it at
229 all. Mr. LaBonte didn’t agree with Town Counsel’s position. He said he had a problem with how the
230 decision was made and felt the residents should have been given prior notice to the Board’s vote. Mr.
231 Haverty explained the Board is authorized to make decisions; however, it was his decision to hold a
232 public hearing to hear the resident’s points of views and feedback. He said they had the option to undo
233 what had been done but they knew if they had, they would be acting in direct defiance of a court order.
234 The order says they would be held in contempt of court if the Town continued to use tax dollars to plow
235 private roads. He said during that meeting he told the residents the Board was not looking to create a
236 problem and walk away from it. He stated that was the reason he had spent a lot of time to solution
237 problems (with Mr. Gladu) and was holding the public hearing. He said the Board understood a
238 problem was created, they did not walk away from it and were trying to partner with the residents to
239 solve it to the very best of their ability and through what the law allowed. Mr. LaBonte stated he
240 respectfully disagreed. Mr. Haverty cited RSA 231:59,A which speaks to an emergency lane and the
241 requirements for such. He felt there were ways around it to get some things done. He didn’t think
242 they would ever find their way back to using tax dollars to plow private roads, but they were trying to
243 work as best they could within the law to get something done.

244

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/November 10, 2020

245 Mr. Lynde explained two years ago the Selectmen discussed plowing/maintaining private roads. He
246 said they voted against stopping at that time because it was late in the season and they wanted residents
247 to have time to get someone to plow the roads. This was essentially giving notice it would happen.
248 The Board withheld making a decision until this past year to stop plowing. He said they worked on the
249 situation over a couple years and realized they were putting the Town at risk and couldn't afford to do
250 so.

251

252 Mr. Haverty said they have had the discussion whether or not the Town would plow private roads; the
253 Board voted, and the decision is done (to not do so). In the interest of the current public hearing the
254 Board needed to know if the residents were interested in the roads being improved and incurring a
255 betterment assessment. If yes, they will need to get it on the warrant for March. He said the Board
256 would not do a thing if the residents weren't interested. Mr. LaBonte appreciated the Board hearing
257 his opinion.

258

259 Mr. Chelton inquired if there was a projected cost for the improvements less the 750ft. (first portion of
260 Campbell Road). Mr. Haverty answered no; the estimated cost from 2007 was \$700,000 +/- . They
261 took that figure and added 3% inflation to come to the current estimated amount. He said it was the
262 only mechanism they had because they could not engineer the road. Mr. Chelton asked if the previous
263 number covered the entire road length. Mr. Haverty didn't have the answer and added they could find
264 out. Mr. Chelton informed there were a few new homes between Dutton Road and where it (Town
265 portion) ends. He added there were people who also used that first portion of the road for access to
266 another cove (in the area of Mr. Gladu's house); it was not just Campbell Grove residents that used the
267 ingress portion from Dutton Road. He said if that was considered in the estimate the residents of that
268 area should be included with the assessment. Mr. Lynde recalled the history of the roads and believed
269 there was a development that put in a road beside the other roads. Mr. Chelton noted Armand Drive
270 was a separate development with a Town road. He explained there were three roads (back to back)
271 Armand Drive which was public and then there was Campbell Road and Grace Road that each went on
272 opposite sides of the lake. He said Campbell Road and Grace Road shared the first 750ft. coming in
273 from Dutton Road to obtain access to properties on different sides of the lake.

274

275 Mr. Haverty said they could include Grace Road to bring more linear footage into what needs to be
276 improved. This would result in more people receiving the betterment assessment. At present he didn't
277 believe the residents on Grace Road had been considered. He said the roads considered were Campbell,
278 Methuen, Andover, and Gaston. Mr. Chelton noted it (Grace Road) would only be considered for the
279 first 750ft.

280

281 Mr. Kevin Crooker, 2 Andover Street came forward. He questioned if the Town was currently plowing
282 the first half of Campbell Road. Mr. Haverty explained since the last meeting (with residents) they
283 found no evidence the first portion of the road was ever accepted by the Town. Mr. Crooker told the
284 Board the length was not 750ft. it was approximately 842ft. based on a blueprint drawn up by surveyors
285 when the road was originally taken over by the Town. That portion had been conveyed so two houses
286 could be built on Campbell Road. He inquired what the Town would do about those houses if the Town
287 didn't accept the road. He said if the Town made a mistake (about that first portion of the road), they
288 should straighten it out not the residents. He offered to provide the Town with a copy of the blueprint.
289 Mr. Haverty said he could leave it at the Selectmen's office for him to review. Mr. Crooker was
290 concerned about his family. He said they (Campbell Grove) had made arrangements to have their
291 portion of the road done. Now he was hearing there was additional road being questioned.

292

293 Mr. Haverty mentioned as he was trying to find his way through the situation with conversations
294 between Town Counsel, residents etc. Mr. Crooker felt the Town had a responsibility to its citizens
295 and didn't care what Town Counsel has stated. He understood everyone had done a lot of work, but

296 now the situation was becoming harder. He believed the Board could determine tonight if they were
297 going to plow the first half of the road. Mr. Haverty replied even if they wanted to plow the first
298 portion, they would have to post a public hearing to accept a Town road 10-days in advance of taking
299 action. Mr. Crooker didn't understand why the Board was not making a decision and asked if they
300 were actually saying they weren't doing anything. Mr. Haverty clarified and told Mr. Crooker he was
301 personally working hard with Mr. Gladu to unwind a problem to find a solution. He could not recall
302 ever saying they would not plow 750ft. (or 842ft) of road. He asked Mr. Gladu if he had ever given
303 the impression of walking away from the problem. Mr. Gladu responded by saying 'not at all'. He
304 said they had a conversation that the first portion (750ft or 842ft) would be plowed this year by the
305 Town. Mr. Haverty stated the conversation was that he was working hard to get that done; right now,
306 he had no authorization to do that. He was working to find a way either through an emergency lane, or
307 accepting the road, or another mechanism. This was the nature of the call he had with Town Counsel
308 earlier in the day. Mr. Gladu said it needed to be done by the Town. He said Campbell Grove had
309 already made a commitment to get their portion of the road plowed, which did not include the first
310 portion. Mr. Haverty reiterated he was working near everyday to figure out how to make that happen.

311

312 Mr. Crooker remained confused whether or not the first portion of the road was being plowed. Mr.
313 Gladu stated he was under the impression that, that (first) portion of Campbell Road would be plowed
314 this year. Ms. Forde clarified with regard to the first 842ft. they needed to find a legal mechanism that
315 let the Town plow that length. She said the Selectmen were obligated to the entire Town of Pelham,
316 not just the residents of Campbell Road; they were trying to find a way to get it done legally.

317

318 Mr. Haverty stated he had been an honest partner. Mr. Gladu agreed he had been. He said they had to
319 put the situation 'to bed' at least (at a minimum) for this year. It was his impression the first portion
320 gets plowed by the Town. Mr. Haverty replied they should expect to see action from the Board in the
321 coming weeks.

322

323 Putting aside the first portion (750ft. or 842ft. of Campbell Road), Mr. Haverty asked Mr. Gladu what
324 the Board should do specifically with regard to the betterment assessment. He wanted to know if it was
325 worth the Board pursuing a warrant article. Mr. Gladu replied he would like thirty days to be able to
326 take a poll or a vote of the Campbell Grove residents to see if they were willing to pursue it. Mr.
327 Haverty replied the Board could go until December 21st for an answer. He said the Board would only
328 pursue it if the residents wanted to move forward. Mr. Gladu told the Board he would let them know
329 within a thirty-day timeframe.

330

331 No one else came forward. Mr. Haverty closed the public hearing and thanked the residents for
332 speaking with them.

333

334 **DISCUSSION**

335

336 **Curbside Trash RFP Update**

337

338 Mr. Haverty stated the RFP was still being advertised and was due back November 27th. He said the
339 Town Administrator had seen some activity and received questions.

340

341 **Deputy Treasurer Position Update**

342

343 Mr. Haverty informed the position was still advertised; applications are being accepted.

344

345 **Revision Energy Contract review**

346

347 Mr. Haverty stated the contract was with Ned Raynolds of ReVision Energy. There had been some
348 red-lined amendments sent to their legal department. Mr. Raynolds will get the contract back to the
349 Selectmen for their next meeting for a vote and possible signature.

350

351 **Placement of signs on Town Property Policy**

352

353 Mr. Haverty stated the Town had a policy where a permit can be pulled to post signs. He believed the
354 Board was looking to repeal the policy and not have signs posted on Town property.

355

356 Mr. Bergeron commented he used the policy when he ran for election to the Board. He saw a problem
357 with people not following the rules or pulling permits, which created a lot of work for Code
358 Enforcement to keep up with. He felt if a person was running for a political position it was good to
359 earn a spot on someone's lawn versus getting a permit and placing signs on Town property. He thought
360 it looked bad for the Village Green to be covered in signs. He supported repealing the policy.

361

362 Mr. Cote shared Mr. Bergeron's sentiments. He personally did not like signs everywhere and felt it
363 was a valuable tool for someone to earn the right to place their sign on someone's property. Given
364 social media and the internet, he didn't think it was necessary to have political signs on public property.

365

366 Mr. Lynde commented he places signs on Town property when running for election but agreed it didn't
367 look good to have signs everywhere. He supported repealing the policy.

368

369 Mr. Haverty said one of his initial questions regarded a person's first amendment rights and received
370 feedback from Town Counsel indicated there were no implications as it was Town property. He said
371 it was the policy that allowed signs. Town Counsel had no concerns regarding a person's free speech.

372

373 Mr. Bergeron informed there was an RSA from the State indicating signs cannot be put on public
374 property without permission, which technically was the Town's policy. He said because the Town had
375 a policy it gave people permission if they followed the rules. He felt they it may get confusing if they
376 allowed public notices and other things to be displayed. Mr. Lynde noted one instance is when the
377 Festival of Trees puts signs up for the event. Mr. Haverty stated the Selectmen could give permission
378 on a one-off basis.

379

380 Mr. Haverty was hearing from the Board to repeal the policy. Mr. Cote inquired if they needed two
381 public hearings. Mr. Haverty answered no; it could be repealed with a simple vote of the Board.

382

MOTION: (Cote/Forde) To repeal the Town's Sign Policy.

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

383

384 **Discussion regarding mask wearing education**

385

386 Mr. Haverty heard the Health Officer speak about education versus a mandate for wearing a mask. He
387 took the discussion as an indication there needed to be further discussion. He spoke earlier in the day
388 with Mr. Bergeron about utilizing digital signage. Mr. Bergeron told the Board he spoke with the Fire
389 and Police Chiefs about placing signs to educate the public and ask that they wear a mask and social
390 distance. He also reached out to Ms. Forde to speak with the schools. He thought if people saw the
391 signs, they might follow the rules better. Mr. Lynde agreed.

392

393 Ms. Forde stated she would reach out to the schools. She felt they needed to include more specific
394 information why wearing a mask was beneficial. Mr. Bergeron suggested including weekly updates
395 regarding the Town and ask the Health Officer to providing working for such. Mr. Haverty agreed with
396 having the Health Officer write the messages for the various signs.

397

398 Mr. Haverty mentioned the high utilization of Town parks, etc. He heard from Mr. Cote that certain
399 areas were packed with people from outside Pelham and the State; no one was wearing masks. He
400 questioned what level of education was needed at Town parks. He also questioned if they wanted to
401 consider closing Town parks to non-residents if the situation got back enough with an increase in cases.

402

403 Mr. Cote commented the State had an order in effect and suggested posting a sign with the guidelines
404 to follow. Mr. Bergeron spoke about the time, based on the weather, for people using the parks. Mr.
405 Cote suggested simply keeping the lights off. The Board discussed shutting the lights off versus closing
406 the parks.

407

408 It was decided to let the outdoor activities continue, provide information about wearing a mask and
409 keep the lights off after dark. The Board will revisit the situation (and case load) at their next meeting.

410

411 **TOWN ADMINISTRATOR / SELECTMEN REPORTS**

412

413 Mr. Lynde asked for consideration to change the air temperature settings in the Municipal offices and
414 Sherburne Hall.

415

416 Mr. Bergeron spoke about election day. He said everything went well and thanked everyone involved.

417

418 Ms. Forde extended a thank you to the volunteers who helped counting absentee ballots on the Saturday
419 before the election.

420

421 Mr. Cote discussed the recent Planning Board meeting and decisions. He reported the Agricultural
422 Commission was hard at work. He will be reaching out to the Animal Control Officer and Code Officer
423 to go over the proposed ordinance. After which the proposed ordinance will be presented to the
424 Selectmen for public hearings. He said the sentiment was to follow the UNH Guidelines now. Mr.
425 Lynde noted water from Peabody Lane needed to be reviewed as it affected residents on Currier Road.
426 He asked that it be included on the Town's list of things to do in addition to the items spoken about at
427 the Planning Board meeting.

428

429 **REQUEST FOR NON-PUBLIC SESSION**

430

MOTION: (Forde/Cote) Request for a non-public session per RSA 91-A:3,II, a (personnel)

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

431 It was noted that when the Board returned, after the non-public session, the Board would not take any
432 other action publicly, except to possibly seal the minutes of the non-public session and to adjourn the
433 meeting. The Board entered into a non-public session at approximately 8:55pm.

434

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

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

435 The Board returned to public session at approximately 9:20pm.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING/November 10, 2020

436

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

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

437

438

439 **ADJOURNMENT**

440

441 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:21pm.

442

443

444

445

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary