

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN**  
**Minutes of June 6, 2016**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Joel Desilets called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. Selectmen Jennifer Simmons, Ross McLeod, and Roger Hohenberger were present; as was Town Administrator David Sullivan. Selectman Bruce Breton was slightly delayed; arriving at 7:05 PM. Mr. Desilets opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS/LIAISON REPORTS:** Mr. Hohenberger noted that the previous day his third granddaughter, Maddie Maguire, had been born. Congratulations and a round of applause followed the announcement.

*Mrs. Simmons* extended thanks to the Fire Department for allowing her to go on a ride along with them and for conducting a mock, post prom accident; noting it had been an eye opening experience. She also extended thanks to her fellow Board members for joining her in participating in the Adopt-a-Spot program.

*Mrs. Simmons* then made the following announcements:

- Popsicles and water will be available for purchase at the Town Beach, which opens this weekend, with proceeds going towards the passive recreation project at Griffin Park.
- Town Day is scheduled for 6/25 at Griffin Park, and the annual Fireworks will take place on 6/29 at the High School.

*As liaison*, Mrs. Simmons advised that the Joint Loss Management Committee had met that morning, and an employee training was scheduled for 6/22. Also, the Searles Trustees have scheduled a meeting with Mr. Sullivan for the following week to discuss the building.

*Mr. McLeod* noted that he had refereed at the Amherst Soccer Tournament the previous week, and extended congratulations to Jamie Manti and the Boys U-12 team.

**BEAUTIFICATION COMMITTEE UPDATES:** Mr. Letizio, on behalf of the Route 111 Committee, opened the discussion with a history of the Committee to date. He then proceeded to review with the Board the Committee's proposal to install four (4) Welcome to Windham signs at key entry points to the Town. The signs will include faux granite break away posts, and cobblestones/landscaping. He indicated that the Committee had met with the NH DOT to determine feasibility/locations of the signs, and had learned that installation in the Committee's preferred locations was not permitted due to Federal laws regarding "clear zones". Mr. Letizio noted that Representative McMahon and Community Development Director Laura Scott had assisted in finding alternate locations.

Mr. Letizio indicated that the Committee must now request permission from the State to install the signs and include the following information: GPS locations; letter from the Selectmen accepting liability and responsibility for the sign maintenance; and, an artist rendition of sign/plantings. Also, no advertising will be permitted on the signs, however, lighting is allowed. Discussion ensued regarding the Town's acceptance of liability. Mr. Letizio then reviewed the proposed locations of the signs, as follows:

- Route 111 east, adjacent to the former Waterhouse Country store
- Route 111 west, just east of the Rail Trail crossing
- Route 111, across from the I93 northbound exit ramp
- Route 111, west of the I93 southbound exit ramp

Mr. Letizio advised that the Committee was requesting that the Board now provide a letter accepting liability/responsibility and authorize the Committee to submit it to the DOT with the other requirements. He also requested that the Board waive the bid process to: 1) accept the bid from Brother's Sign in the amount of \$20,800 for creation and installation of the signs and; 2) approve the expenditure of \$4,200 with Delahunty Nurseries for the landscaping of the four signs as shown.

Mr. McLeod noted that the proposed “Settled in 1719” seemed incorrect to him, as we were not Windham at that time. Discussion ensued regarding the existing signs versus when the Town was incorporated. Mr. McLeod then inquired about the color choice of black with gold, and discussion ensued in that other communities utilize that color scheme which is also encouraged by Town regulations.

Mr. Hohenberger sought clarification of the location of the third sign, and Mr. Letizio clarified it was across 111 from the ramp. Further discussion ensued regarding the color scheme.

Mr. Hohenberger then questioned the sign cost; noting the Board had no idea as to whether the price quoted was a good one. Mr. Letizio replied, as an example, that the sign at his business which is similar will be 3-4 times the cost quoted. He indicated that the Committee, who collectively has much experience with purchasing signs, felt unanimously that this was a good price. Brief discussion ensued regarding whether 23K gold paint was necessary.

Mrs. Simmons expressed support for the black color scheme, adding she would prefer the sign reflect the established date rather than the settled. She then inquired how the lighting fit into the design. Mr. Letizio noted that low voltage LED lights will be placed in the mulch bed so the sign is uplit. Mrs. Simmons inquired whether this was included in the cost, and Mr. Letizio replied in the affirmative. Brief discussion ensued regarding solar lighting.

Mr. Desilets expressed support for the look of the sign and the lighting; inquiring whether there was a cost benefit to the breakaway posts. Mr. Letizio indicated he believed they were actually more expensive, however, the vendor has committed to the cost as presented; adding if they turn out to be less, then that would be reflected, as well.

Mr. Sullivan clarified for the record that a waiver is needed on the signs only, as the landscaping cost is below the bid requirement threshold.

Mr. McLeod moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to waive the bid process regarding purchase of the signs. Passed 4-1, with Mr. Hohenberger opposed.

Mr. McLeod moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to accept the bid from Brothers Sign in the amount of \$20,800, and to approve the expense of \$4,200 to Delahunty Nurseries as shown. Further, that a letter be provided as requested and the Committee be authorized to submit same to the State. Finally, that the sign read “Incorporated in 1742.”

Mr. McLeod then read a portion of the Town Charter, and a discussion ensued regarding the term “established” versus “incorporated”. Mr. Desilets and Mrs. Simmons preferred established, while Mr. Breton and Mr. Hohenberger had no preference. Mr. McLeod noted that, throughout the Charter “incorporated” is referenced; questioning what “established” meant. He felt “incorporated” encompassed the legal significance of when we became a community.

Motion passed unanimously.

**Mr. Sullivan** then provided a brief update of the Town Common Committee’s efforts; noting that a conceptual plan of the Town Common, as well as an as-built, are complete. He indicated that once the overlay of the plans is complete, the Committee will undertake a value based approach to establishing a budget to bring to the Board; hopefully within the next 30 days. Discussion ensued regarding scheduling of the upcoming Board meetings due to holidays.

**COMMITTEE INTERVIEWS:** The Board heard from/posed questions to several individuals interested in being appointed to various committees, as follows:

- EDC: Dr. Melissa Manguson and George Fredette spoke with the Board. In addition, Dom Feroce and Keyur Patel will be at the 6/20 meeting.

- Local Energy: Current member Mark Kovacs spoke with the Board. Peter Seiran will be attending the 6/20 meeting.
- Forestry: Jim Fricchione spoke with the Board.
- Searles Trustees: Roy Dennehy spoke with the Board.
- 275<sup>th</sup> Anniversary: Jamie Baker will attend the 6/20 meeting.
- Cable Advisory: Members Bob Coole and Barbara Coish spoke with the Board.
- Housing Authority: Member Charlie McMahon spoke with the Board.
- HDC: Members Frank Farmer, Derek Saffie, and Wendy Williams spoke with the Board.
- Recreation: Members Dave Curto and Mark Lucas spoke with the Board. Jamie Baker will be at the 6/20 meeting and Dom Feroce will endeavor to be, as well.
- Museum Trustees: Members Jean Manthorne and Carol Pynn spoke with the Board.
- EDC: Member Lisa Walker arrived and spoke with the Board. It was noted that member Ralph Valentine is also seeking to be reappointed.

Mr. Sullivan suggested that the Board defer making any decision on certain appointments until the June 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, in order that they could hear from the new people that had applied.

**NON-PUBLIC SESSION:** Mr. McLeod then moved and Mr. McLeod seconded to enter into a nonpublic session in accordance with RSA 91-A:3 II c. The topic of discussion was reputations and the Board and Mr. Sullivan were in attendance.

*Mr. Desilets* called the public session back to order at 8:10 PM.

Mr. McLeod then moved, and Mr. Breton seconded to make the following appointments:

- Bob Coole and Barbara Coish, Cable Advisory Board Regulars, 3 year terms
- Jim Finn and Lisa Ferrisi, Conservation Commission Regulars, 3 year terms; Maria O’Sullivan Alternate, 3 year term
- Charlie McMahon, Housing Authority, 5 year term
- Frank Farmer and Wendy Williams, HDC Regulars, 3 year terms; also, move Derek Saffie from Alternate to Regular, one year term
- Mark Lucas and Dave Curto, Recreation Committee Regular, 3 year terms
- Jean Manthorne, Museum Trustee Regular, 3 year term; also, Carol Pynn, Museum Alternate, 3 year term
- Mark Kovacs, Local Energy Committee Regular, 3 year term
- Jim Fricchione, Forestry Committee, 3 year term
- Roy Dennehy, Searles Trustee Regular, 3 year term

After brief discussion regarding the upcoming interviews on the 20<sup>th</sup>, motion passed unanimously.

**TAX ABATEMENTS/WARRANTS:** Scott Marsh, MRI Consultant, reviewed several property tax abatement requests with the Board, with the following decisions being made:

- 2-B-251 (\$2,252.36); adjusted due to increases in building tables. Mr. Hohenberger moved and Mr. McLeod seconded to approve the abatement request. Passed unanimously.
- 24-F-642 (\$2,145.94); comparables were provided as requested. After discussion regarding improvements made to the property, this was tabled for more information.
- 24-F-4020 (\$1,735.43); comparables were provided as requested. Mr. Hohenberger moved and Mr. Breton seconded to approve the abatement request. Passed unanimously.

- 24-F-4022 (1,370.53); discussion regarding the disparity in the percentage of increase and the validity of the 2014 data, this was tabled for more information.
- 1-A-203 (\$501.73); adjusted due to listing errors/condition rating. Mr. McLeod moved and Mr. Breton seconded to approve the abatement request. Passed unanimously.
- 1-B-1035 (\$675.49); adjusted due to market analysis/outbuilding error. Mr. McLeod moved and Mr. Breton seconded to approve the abatement request. Passed unanimously.
- 7-A-698 (\$4,793.60); adjusted due to listing/data errors. Mr. Hohenberger moved and Mr. McLeod seconded to approve the abatement request. Passed unanimously.
- 19-B-100 (\$2,154.62); discussion regarding the owner appraisal and improvements made to the property. Tabled for further information.

Brief discussion ensued regarding the tabled items, which will be “deemed denied” if no action is taken as of July 1.

*Mr. Marsh* reviewed a Land Use Change Tax abatement request for parcel 13-B-85 in the amount of \$12,500. After brief discussion, Mr. Hohenberger moved Mr. McLeod seconded to deny the request as recommended. Passed unanimously.

Mr. Marsh then presented for consideration issuance of land use change tax bills for the following parcels:

- 6-C-101 to 109 and 113 to 119 (\$5,500 per lot, with the exception of 5 lots to be billed at lesser amounts). Lengthy discussion ensued regarding the current use process, the time of the change, the lack of infrastructure in place at the time, and that this represents the third property owner since the land was placed in current use.

Mr. Hohenberger moved to deny issuance of the warrant. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that such a motion was not appropriate as it related to billing, suggesting that Mr. Marsh be asked to recalculate the amounts instead. Further discussion ensued in that the Board has only 18 months from the change to bill, and that \$55,000 was the estimated fair market value in January 2015; the time of the use change.

Mr. Sullivan noted that, if the road were in place, the value would have been higher; reminding the Board that the Town had previously lost a case in which they had included the unconstructed road in the value. Further discussion ensued before Mr. Hohenberger withdrew his motion.

Mr. Marsh will recalculate the market value inclusive of the road and present at the next meeting.

- 24-F-606 (\$4,000); Mr. Hohenberger moved and Mr. Breton seconded to issue the LUCT warrant as recommended. Passed unanimously.
- 14-B-2801 (\$12,765); Mr. Hohenberger moved and Mr. McLeod seconded to issue the LUCT warrant as recommended. Passed unanimously.

**HIGHCLERE SUBDIVISION:** Ms. Scott explained that the Planning Board had approved the subdivision in 2015 with enhanced landscaping in the Chestnut cul-de-sac, which the Town would need to maintain as it is a Town road. She added this is also before the Board relative to a cistern to be located in the middle of the cul-de-sac which will be needed in the event the two related homes are not equipped with sprinkler systems.

Mr. McLeod sought clarification that the Planning Board had accepted the plan with sprinklers, thus the Certificates of Occupancy are contingent upon their being installed. Ms. Scott noted that she had worked with Deputy Chief Bill Martineau on this matter, and that the sprinklers may be unenforceable. Mr. McLeod disagreed that it would be unenforceable, citing RSA 674:36, IV. Chief McPherson noted that the process has always been that a location for a cistern must be shown on the plan in case the sprinklers aren't installed; adding that if they are installed they must be operational prior to issuance of a COA. Lengthy discussion ensued relative to the state statutes and sprinkler installation.

Discussion then briefly moved to the landscaping request, with Mr. McLeod noting he had no issues with same and Ms. Scott noting it had been requested by the abutters. Mr. Desilets questioned what standard of care the Town would be signing up for.

Mr. Breton then raised concerns about the cistern, questioning why the Planning Board would approve a plan with it in the cul-de-sac; adding that should have come to the Board of Selectmen for a right of way permit. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Karl Dubay, Engineer for the project, approached noting that the Planning Board was never shown a plan with a cistern located, because sprinklers in the homes had been promised; adding he had been asked at the last minute where the cistern was. Mr. Dubay indicated he did not want the cistern there, and that he did not know he was legally required to do so, as his condition of approval was installation of the sprinklers. As to the landscaping, Mr. Dubay indicated native plants are planned similar to those on Telo Road, and confirmed that the landscaping had been requested by the neighbors. He went on to note that the Planning Board had been very clear that, if the Selectmen do not approve the landscaping, it is not an issue. Mr. Dubay then went on to cite several concerns regarding the handling of the project by staff. Discussion ensued in that it behooves the developer to do the sprinklers so that they can obtain their COA, and whether the landscaping was a condition of approval.

Mr. Dubay noted that he would love to provide the landscaping, but if the Selectmen do not approve the installation he is not going back to the Planning Board. Mr. Desilets indicated he was inclined to approve the landscaping, as the Town would not be specifying a level of care. Ms. Scott noted that nowhere is a certain level of care required; adding that Highway Agent Jack McCartney has been involved in this process and is okay with the landscaping being installed. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Bob Pliskin, developer, approached expressing his frustration with the process; noting the plan should have been approved in September. He asked that the Board direct that the cistern be removed from the required bond of \$90K, as it does not need to be there. Discussion ensued, and Ms. Scott pointed out that there are two cisterns in the overall development, and that the one in question was never bonded.

Chief McPherson noted that the Department requires cisterns in subdivisions with three or more house lots and that one was required to be on the plan for the actual subdivision. Discussion ensued and it was noted that all of Highclere will have sprinklers. Chief McPherson noted that NHFPA 1142 speaks to the need for a rural water system, and that the Department has an agreement with Planning that cisterns will be shown in such cases.

Mr. McLeod moved that any monies relative to cisterns be removed from the bond. Mr. Hohenberger noted that the Board does not have the bond in front of them, and it was not part of the scheduled agenda. Discussion ensued.

Mr. McLeod felt it onerous to bond them for something that will never be installed. Ms. Scott noted that she was working with Keach and Deputy Martineau to ensure it would be, if necessary. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. McLeod then moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to strike any financial reference from the bond calculations relative to cisterns. Passed unanimously.

Mr. Hohenberger inquired whether the Board could approve the landscaping without maintenance requirements. A brief discussion resulted in an affirmative response.

Mr. Breton then moved and Mr. Hohenberger seconded to have staff work with Mr. Dubay to landscape the cul-de-sac. Mr. Breton asked that Mr. Dubay attempt to keep the plants low maintenance/ground cover in nature. After brief discussion, motion passed unanimously.

**REVIEW OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE:** Mr. Desilets explained that one of the Board's goals for 2016 was to review organizational structures and that the Economic Development Committee had recently approached the Board with a recommendation to hire a fulltime Economic Development Director to spur development in Windham. He then noted that two letters had been received relative to this agenda item, as follows:

- From Mr. Jonathan Sycamore, who felt the addition of a full time Director was foolish
- From Planning Board Chairman Paul Gosslin, who was in support of the position

Mr. Sullivan indicated that he has spoken to the Board members, EDC Chair Ed Gallagher, Ms. Scott, and residents regarding this recommendation. He indicated that the Board has yet to brainstorm any ideas as to what type of departmental structure could be done. Mr. Sullivan reminded all that Ms. Scott spends 30% of her time on Economic Development, both encouraging new and fostering existing businesses; adding he believed there were at least 5 potential structures should the Board intend to move forward on the EDC's recommendation. He indicated he would encourage that they make a decision as expeditiously as possible, as recruitment has been completed for the vacant Town Planner and it is not fair to bring anyone into a nebulous situation. Mr. Sullivan also reminded the Board that the current staff is working with only sporadic, interim assistance.

He then suggested that the potential solutions might be:

1. Do nothing
2. Utilize the existing staff of a Community Development Director and Town Planner but reassign the Economic Development duties between the two
3. Utilize the existing staff but change the Community Development Director to a Planning Director and utilize the excess salary to bring in an Economic Development Director rather than a Planner
4. Bring in an additional person, part time or a consultant; adding he would recommend the latter
5. Bring in a full time, new staff member in addition to the current staff

Mr. Sullivan noted that as to costs, based upon his research a new full time Economic Development Director would cost upwards of \$100,000 per year with benefits; whereas realigning the existing staff could cost less than \$20,000 additional. Mr. Desilets inquired whether the Town Planner position would be removed from the Municipal Union, and Mr. Sullivan replied in the negative.

Mr. Sullivan noted that despite numerous conversation regarding this, he has not seen any facts that support a new, separate, Economic Development Director. He indicated a job description hasn't even been developed and the position should be charged with supporting all business, both existing and new.

Mrs. Simmons inquired whether the Board, historically, creates \$100,000 positions that are not in the budget. Mr. Sullivan noted that, generally, we do not put new positions in the budget without going to Town Meeting. He indicated that two years ago the new Community Resource Officer position had gone on the Town Warrant; adding that the Board could establish a new position, but would do so at political their peril. Mr. McLeod indicated he found option 3 intriguing. Discussion ensued regarding the costs for a new planner with benefits versus a contractor.

Mr. Hohenberger pointed out that it has been established over the years that we do need both a Town Planner and Director. He indicated he is concerned that if Ms. Wood's position is not filled it will leave the department with a huge void; adding he would propose looking to have a strong planner position. He felt that it is not the lack of an Economic Development person that is causing businesses to not come to Windham; rather it is that there is no water or sewer and that I-93 is still in flux. Mr. Hohenberger felt that a big change in development will occur on its own within a couple of years; suggesting that the Board hire a good, strong planner and change Ms. Scott's economic development focus to 50%.

Lengthy discussion ensued regarding how much emphasis the Board wanted on businesses, the availability of regional economic development services in Salem that the EDC should avail themselves of, and the desire for the best/highest businesses in Windham.

Mr. Gallagher approached noting that the EDC wanted to start a conversation about this; adding that Ms. Scott works very hard but more emphasis is needed. He pointed out the surrounding towns are all increasing their emphasis on economic development, and that the next 2 or 3 years will chart the Town for the next 50 or 100 years. Lengthy discussion ensued.

Mr. Bruce Richardson, EDC member, approached noting that he had missed the EDC meeting at which this was discussed. He noted that Windham has had a reputation as being negative on development, and that had changed much since Ms. Scott and the EDC had come on board. Mr. Richardson felt that economic development is driven first by infrastructure, noting that areas like the Professional Business and Technology district cannot work as envisioned due to the lack of water and sewer. He noted that such zones were created with a negative vibe towards business, and that the areas were ruined for the possibilities of what they could have been. Mr. Richardson felt that the Market Square district also cannot work without infrastructure, and that the focus should not be on a salesperson who'll tell people where to put their money, but rather on getting infrastructure. He felt that, if it were made attractive to them, developers will fund the infrastructure; adding that there are already established means available to advertise the Town. Mr. Richardson then pointed out that the voters had turned down a request for \$30,000 to do a study; reiterating that the focus should be strongly on infrastructure. He indicated that Windham is going to grow, and it doesn't take a sales person to bring it about, it takes the right conditions.

Mrs. Margaret Case approached noting that she had come to Windham from a similar town in New Jersey which had also experienced an interstate being constructed through the Town. She noted that surrounding communities had allowed everything to pass under the belief that taxes would go down; however, they had risen due to the need for additional town services, equipment, fire/police, and school impacts. She felt that if we start pushing economic development beyond a certain point, our taxes will not decrease but will go up instead. Mrs. Case felt a lot of study needed to be done on this matter, and it be fully vetted out; adding she would be opposed at this time to spending \$100K on a new person. She felt the Board needed to deal with existing issues, such as building maintenance, before spending such funds.

Ms. Vanessa Nysten approached indicating that she sees a conflict with having one individual covering both planning and economic development. She felt that a full time Economic Development person was not necessary, but rather a part time individual; reiterating, however, that there is a strong conflict with one person having both roles.

Mrs. Simmons indicated that she appreciated the work the EDC has done but, at this time, she would have a hard time supporting a \$100K position. Mr. McLeod concurred, reiterating his support for option three which would be a wash financially. Mr. Desilets noted that he has looked at job descriptions for economic development directors, and that a better understanding is needed of what Ms. Scott does as far as planning. He indicated he was also not prepared to move forward at this time.

Mr. Sullivan noted he has no issue with providing data to the Board, such as financials, however as to the question of whether one could be both Department Head and the Town Planner the Board would need to speak with Ms. Scott as he is not in a position to make an educated opinion on same. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Breton moved and Mr. Hohenberger seconded to table the discussion and ask the Economic Development Committee to look into regional programs which are available. Mr. Breton added that the Board has too much to do and he is not interested in reorganizing the Department.

Mr. Desilets found it disrespectful that Mr. Breton would not allow other board members to research this further if they wish to; adding that he will continue to do so. Mr. Hohenberger noted that he did not see this working, adding that they have a non-public discussion upcoming on a position that has to be filled. Mrs. Simmons concurred.

Lengthy discussion ensued regarding the options presented by Mr. Sullivan, the effect of Mr. Breton's motion, and the need for more information from staff and the EDC.

Mr. Gallagher expressed concerns regarding a lack of vision, noting that however it is structured he believed there is a creative way to provide more emphasis on economic development to help shape the fabric of it in Windham. Mr. Breton took exception to Mr. Gallagher's remarks, and lengthy discussion ensued.

Mr. Sullivan agreed that the Economic Development Director should not be the Town Planner, also that the Code Enforcement Administrator should not be either of the two. He noted that the Planner's duties are known, as Ms. Wood had a specific role that was augmented by Ms. Scott. He felt the question was, if we only have an Economic Development Director and a Town Planner, can the Planner do all but the business duties.

After lengthy, further discussion on volunteer efforts, the vacant position, the options presented by Mr. Sullivan, and other related issues, Mr. Breton's motion passed 3-2, with Mr. Desilets and Mr. McLeod opposed.

The Chair noted his opposition was because any Board member should be able to bring up an item. Further discussion ensued, however no other decisions were made.

**SNHPC 10-YEAR PLAN:** Ms. Scott indicated that the Town has several items already included in the Plan, and that the purpose of this agenda item was to ascertain whether they wished to make any changes. After a brief discussion, the consensus was to make no changes to the current submissions.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS:** Mr. Sullivan advised that, after a call from a resident regarding early morning whistle use at Griffin Park, it had been learned there was a resident conducting dog training. She had been advised that she needed to obtain permission to do so, and was requesting same from the Board.

Discussion ensued, and Mr. McLeod noted that her request does not fall under Section C of the Use Policy as it is written, as she is not part of an organized training program; rather she is training her own dog.

Mr. Hohenberger then moved and Mr. McLeod seconded to deny the request for a permit. Passed unanimously.

*Mrs. Simmons* indicated that she had received several complaints regarding traffic issues on Route 111, and had been stuck herself; noting it took her a half hour one day to get from McDonalds to the Village Green. Ms. Scott approached and advised that Project Manager Wendy Johnson is scheduled to be in Town on the 22<sup>nd</sup> to provide an update on the project. The meeting is scheduled from 6:30 to 8:00 PM in the Community Development Department.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** Mr. Sullivan advised that the State will be offering for sale surplus property located at 17-H-30 for \$652,500. He indicated that, as always, the Town has the right of first refusal; adding he had, procedurally, solicited comments from the Planning Board, Conservation, and EDC with no response.

Mr. Hohenberger moved and Mr. McLeod seconded to not purchase the property in question. Passed unanimously.

**COMMITTEE INTERVIEWS, CONTINUED:** Mr. Dom Feroce, who had not been present earlier in the meeting, spoke with the Board regarding his interest in being appointed to the EDC and/or Recreation.

**CORRESPONDENCE, CONTINUED:** Mr. Sullivan presented to the Board for acceptance a list of 212 unregistered dogs, noting that civil forfeitures will be going out from the Town Clerk. Mr. Hohenberger moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to accept same and proceed with issuance of civil forfeitures. Passed unanimously.

*Mr. Sullivan* advised that the School District has requested release of their Impact fees in the amount of \$161,961. Mr. Hohenberger moved and Mr. McLeod seconded to approve the release as requested. Passed unanimously.

**MINUTES:** Mr. McLeod moved and Mr. Hohenberger seconded to approve the minute of 2/21 and 3/7 as written. Passed 4-0-1, with Mrs. Simmons abstaining.

Mr. McLeod moved and Mr. Hohenberger seconded to approve the minutes of 3/21, 4/4, 4/18, 5/2, and 5/16 as written. Passed unanimously.

**NON-PUBLIC SESSION:** Mr. Hohenberger moved and Mr. McLeod seconded to enter into nonpublic session in accordance with RSA 91-A:3 II b and d. The topics of discussion were personnel and land.

The Board, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. Scott, and Ms. Devlin were in attendance in the first session.

The Board discussed the vacant planner position and interim consultants. Mr. Hohenberger moved and Mr. Breton seconded to hire the recommended candidate subject to the employment policy. Passed 3-2, with Mr. Desilets and Mr. McLeod opposed.

The Board, Mr. Sullivan, and Ms. Devlin were in attendance in the remaining sessions.

Mr. Sullivan updated the Board on a personnel matter relative to a background check. Mr. McLeod moved and Mr. Breton seconded to authorize Mr. Sullivan to proceed as discussed. Passed unanimously.

Mr. Sullivan reviewed several purchase and sales agreements with the Board.

Mr. McLeod moved and Mr. Hohenberger seconded to accept the offer on Farmer Road as presented and authorize Mr. Sullivan to sign all paperwork related to the sale on behalf of the Town. Passed unanimously.

Mr. McLeod moved and Mr. Breton moved to authorize Mr. Sullivan to submit a counter offer for Gaumont Road. Failed 2-3, with Mrs. Simmons, Mr. Desilets, and Mr. Hohenberger opposed.

Mr. McLeod moved and Mr. Breton seconded to adjourn. Passed unanimously.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:15 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendi Devlin, Administrative Assistant

*Note: These minutes are in draft form and have not been submitted to the Board for approval.*