

FINAL

BOARD OF SELECTMEN'S MEETING

NOVEMBER 1, 1999

7:30 P.M. - MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING - HANOVER, NH

The meeting of the Board of Selectmen was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by the Chairman, Brian Walsh. Present were: Brian Walsh, Chairman; Marilyn W. Black, Vice-Chairman; Katherine S. Connolly; John Manchester; John Colligan; Julia Griffin, Town Manager; and members of the public.

Mr. Walsh announced that this meeting was being taped by CATV 6 and that hearing enhancement equipment was available for anyone who wished to use it.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT.

There was no public comment.

Chair Walsh indicated that the order of the agenda items would be changed.

3. REQUEST TO APPROVE SUBMITTAL OF APPLICATION FOR ADDITIONAL BIODIVERSITY GRANT

Mr. Walsh explained that the Biodiversity Grant was finishing up the first year of a two year grant, and the second year of the grant now needs to be applied for.

Shawn Donovan, Chairman of the Biodiversity Committee, indicated that the grant from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was awarded in the spring, with the contract being executed in May of 1999. The purpose of the grant was to conduct a biodiversity inventory to identify ecologically significant areas of Town. Since the grant was awarded, the Town Selectmen set up a committee, of which Mr. Donovan is the Chairman. He explained that in addition to the committee, they have received a commitment from the biology department at Dartmouth to conduct a multi-year sampling of the ecology of the Town at 40 to 50 sites.

To obtain expert technical assistance, Mr. Donovan stated that the committee contracted with the Nature Conservancy which is an international organization well known for its innovative conservation activities in the United States and across the world. The Conservancy has been conducting field surveys since the summer throughout Town at approximately 24 to 30 locations. Each landowner involved was contacted in advance of the surveys, and no landowner denied right of entry to either Town officials or members of the Nature Conservancy. Mr. Donovan noted that the interim report is expected within 30 to 45 days.

Mr. Donovan indicated that he had originally asked the Town to contribute \$5,000 to be used as matching against federal money. Because there were so many applicants last year, the committee gave the Fish and Wildlife Service the opportunity to either grant one-year funding at the end of which the committee would simply notify them for the second year, or to give all of the funding at once. The Fish and Wildlife Service elected to

give one year funding; they have advised the committee that they do not need to formally reapply, but rather need to simply provide them with a letter that they will continue their work as originally set forth. Mr. Donovan asked the Selectboard to reaffirm its support with an additional \$2,500 for fiscal year 2001. He pointed out that the actual cash expended so far is less than \$300 for the purchase of current aerial photographs, but that \$9,100 has been committed by contract with the Nature Conservancy. He added that less than one-half of the actual scope of work proposed has been completed. The second year of work will include an educational component, contacting landowners, holding workshops and additional fieldwork. The committee hopes to provide the information to the Open Space committee which is currently working to develop criteria for protecting lands in Town for conservation purposes.

Mr. Walsh stated that while he thinks the work being done by the committee is good, he would be loathe to make any kind of budget commitments given what is happening with statewide education funding. He asked if in-kind personnel efforts of the Town or private contributions would be considered legitimate matching mounts. He pointed out that he is really concerned about what is happening tax-wise.

Mr. Donovan answered that federal grants are supposed to require 50% matching for every dollar. He added, however, that they do allow in-kind contributions as well as money spent on the Keeping Track program of which six residents from Hanover participated last year, to count toward the grant. He pointed out that the original proposal was that Hanover would raise locally \$5,000 and the federal government would give \$10,000. He feels that everything possible has been done with other sources and in-kind sources, and that what is really needed is cash. Mr. Donovan offered to propose that the budget would contain more soft money and see how they would react. He suggested that he could go to the Hanover Conservation Council for funding as one possibility.

Ms. Black indicated that the Board made a commitment for \$5,000 last year, and regardless of the budget situation this year, she feels that the Board owes it to the committee to keep that commitment.

Mr. Colligan spoke in support of the committee's work and of funding it, with the understanding that the possibility exists of finding some money from within the Conservation Commission. However, he feels that he would like to see the Town participate in a meaningful way. He added that he does not see a lot of opportunity or financial history of the Town participating in conservation efforts.

Mr. Colligan asked who would get the information as a result of the findings of the work. Mr. Donovan answered that the information would be given to the Planning Board and the Conservation Commission.

Ms. Connolly pointed out that encouragement for the work of the committee began at the Planning Board. She feels it is a very invaluable study, and since it is now midway through it is not a new proposal.

Ms. Griffin indicated that she was not sure whether funds could be obtained from the Conservation Commission fund, adding that the Board still needs to resolve the

conservation Memo of Understanding which gives some discretion to expend money from the fund. She feels that the fund would be a suitable purpose as a source of funding, and it would be budgeted effective July 1, 2000 which is when the money would be required to match the federal grant.

Mr. Manchester agreed with Mr. Walsh that this is an unprecedented time as far as education funding is concerned, and this would be a good time to perhaps find another way to come up with the \$2,500.

Ms. Black stated that the conservation fund is earning more than \$2,500 a year, and that the Board made a commitment to fund the work.

Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION that the Board very much support completion of the Biodiversity Grant and that the Town commit, although not necessarily from the General Fund but perhaps from the Conservation Fund or through private donations, the sum of \$2,500 to complete the work. Ms. Black SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO VERY MUCH SUPPORT COMPLETION OF THE BIODIVERSITY GRANT AND THAT THE TOWN COMMIT, ALTHOUGH NOT NECESSARILY FROM THE GENERAL FUND BUT PERHAPS FROM THE CONSERVATION FUND OR THROUGH PRIVATE DONATIONS, THE SUM OF \$2,500 TO COMPLETE THE WORK.

2. DISCUSSION OF STATEWIDE SCHOOL FUNDING DEVELOPMENTS

Ms. Griffin distributed information showing the Hanover tax impact of HB 999. She noted that the House voted down HB 109, which was the Hager-Below bill. HB 999, introduced by Rep. Hess, is known as the Speaker's bill because it is the House leadership bill which would impose a \$6.60 statewide property tax with no sunset provision, and includes a hardship provision that at least in the first year would appear to apply principally to residents who would be eligible for hardship exemption in donor communities. She commented that there are two other communities in the state, Mason and Seabrook, where residents might qualify for the hardship exemption, but it would primarily be focused on donor communities because it applies primarily to people who see a net increase in the school portion of their tax rate.

Ms. Black asked what the guidelines were for a hardship exemption. Ms. Griffin answered that the guidelines have to do with a combination of income, assessed value of the home as well as other things which are included in the formula.

Ms. Griffin explained that Senator King introduced a bill which was defeated recently in the Senate. This bill has recently been revised and the Senate is apparently working very hard on it. The bill would also include a \$6.60 statewide property tax, but would sunset in two years. The assumption is the reason it would sunset is that it is a short-term fix that makes the method of taxation probably the premiere issue in the next statewide election, and essentially allows the Adequacy Commission and the Equity Commission time to finish their work addressing both the adequacy formula and the fairness of the vehicle that is being proposed. Ms. Griffin explained that under this bill in two years from its adoption the statewide property tax would sunset, and presumably by that time the state would be

ready to transition to whatever the state decided it wanted to do on a permanent basis.

Ms. Griffin has heard that the majority of the Senate is in favor of a two year sunset on a \$6.60 statewide property tax, and it appears that the rank and file members of the House may be leaning also toward a two year sunset rather than a permanent \$6.60 statewide property tax.

Ms. Griffin indicated that Rep. Hess had notified the Municipal Association that there were not enough votes for HB 999 and that he needed the Municipal Association to help get the bill through the House. The Municipal Association's response was that they were hearing from their members that many of them were concerned about HB 999 because their fear is that in two years more communities will fall into the donor category under the assumption that the cost to fund an adequate education is only going to increase.

Ms. Griffin informed the Selectmen that she had recently received the tax bill from the county recently. The bill emphasized 10% interest due after December 17; she subsequently called the county commissioners to ask if, in fact, they would consider supporting a quick piece of legislation which would waive the 10% interest charge for late payments from municipalities. She found the county commissioners extremely receptive.

Ms. Griffin feels that the Municipal Association would work with them to draft a piece of legislation which would essentially allow communities some room up to 30 days to pay their county taxes. She explained that some communities may want to extend beyond November 15th when they send out their tax bills. Sending out two tax bills can be expensive and problematic for escrow accounts held by banks.

Mr. Walsh suggested that Ms. Griffin ask the county commissioners to sponsor a bill which would allow a late receipt of payments until either the state adequacy grant is paid or January 15, whichever is later.

Ms. Griffin indicated that most county's tax anticipation notes come due on December 29th or 30th. She explained that the intent of the request is not to force the problems of the municipality onto anyone else, but rather to allow communities time to get their financial footing back underneath them.

Mr. Manchester questioned the mechanics of setting the tax rate, and wondered when it would be set. Ms. Griffin explained that if the \$6.60 statewide property tax rate passes it is not problematic; it will only require recertifying the rates. The problems occur if there is any variation on the \$6.60 as it would require resetting all of the tax rates in the state.

Mr. Manchester asked if it is actually necessary to send a tax bill in order for people to be required to pay their taxes. Ms. Griffin answered that it has been suggested that if school districts were to run into financial trouble, they could simply send out a letter of request asking people to voluntarily pay the school portion of their tax rate. She noted that the Attorney General's office has issued an opinion stating it would be illegal for communities to solicit contributions in advance of being able to send out tax bills. She added that 5% had been collected already in a scenario where in the first year 10% was to be collected. Those funds were collected last July and are sitting in a fund.

Ms. Black stressed the importance of being able to articulate to the taxpayers how to figure out what they will have to pay.

Ms. Griffin explained that the taxpayers would only need to take their July tax bill and add 10% to get an approximation of what they will have to pay.

Ms. Griffin explained that the hope is that before the House takes up HB 999, the Senate and House will have reached a compromise so that amendments can be made to the bill on the floor of the House that reflect the Senate's input. If the entire bill is adopted, it is done; there is no committee of conference required. She noted that the scenario which could take more time would be if there is not support for the Senate's amendments on the House floor, the House spends days debating HB 999 and passes something over to the Senate. In this scenario, if the Senate does not like the bill that is passed over, they kill it and putting the matter back where it started. If a bill is ended up with which has two very different renditions, one in the House and one in the Senate, they would put together a committee of conference whose job it would be to try to come up with an acceptable compromise that both bodies could approve.

Ms. Black commented that the \$6.60 statewide property tax would not make up the shortfall of the adequacy number. Ms. Griffin agreed that HB 999 does not address the \$100 million shortfall. Under the House leadership's bill that would have to come out of funding reductions for state agencies. Under the Senate's version, the bill would include provisions that would use surplus to fund the \$100 million gap. She explained that the problem with using surplus to fund the gap and the reason the sunset clause is included in the bill is that there is only enough surplus to fill the gap for two budget cycles. After those two cycles, it would need to expire because they would have run out of state surplus unless the state generates additional surpluses in the future.

Mr. Walsh noted that he had gone to the House Finance Committee recently and testified on Hanover's behalf against HB 999 as follows:

" I am chairman of the Board of Selectmen of Hanover, a donor community, and a businessman having done business in the state since 1975. I am not here just to whine and plead the donor communities' case; we appreciate the intent of HB 999 to relieve hardship on our senior citizens. I have spent considerable time studying the education funding dilemma over the past two months; based on this work I am convinced that a property tax based plan for funding the state's education responsibilities is fundamentally unsound. It is not unsound just from the perspective of the donor communities, but from many different perspectives. HB 999 is not a fiscally sound base for financing education. Even pushing the property tax as far as politically expedient in the spring along with raises in the unearned income tax and one time tobacco money, there is still a \$100 million dollar deficit. Over the longer run the tax base does not keep up with the growth in students or reasonably constrained educational costs. Projections indicate that in 2005 an additional 24 more towns would become donors including Bedford, Salem and Lebanon, among others. It also may not be constitutionally sound. If this bill passes, HB 999, and education is funded by a property tax, it is very likely that some donor communities will ask the Supreme Court to review the constitutionality of the statewide property tax. Given the inequities created by the widely disparate assessment practices throughout the state, it

could well be that 6 months from now we are back in the same situation with an unconstitutional bill. It is not sound for business. The short term uncertainty is chilling for future business planning and the prospects of continuing increases in the unearned income tax, business taxes, and capital gains taxes all destroy the good business climate we have created as a state. It is not politically sound. It pits town against town and relies disproportionately on the elderly by focusing on property combined with the interest and dividends tax. And finally, it flies in the face of New Hampshire values which are based on fundamental long-term fiscal soundness."

Mr. Walsh then spoke as an individual, making it clear that he was not speaking for the Town but as an individual Selectman:

"To fund its educational responsibilities, I am convinced that the state needs to use another broad based tax beyond the property tax and the unearned income tax on which we now rely. HB 109, which was the income tax just reported from the Senate, is the only viable alternative on the table at this time. It is not perfect, but then nothing is. Constrained to education only and requiring a 3/5 vote to increase the level of taxation, I believe that the citizens and legislators of New Hampshire can use this tool while maintaining our core state value of frugality and fiscal prudence. It is against my individual interest, although probably not so as I age. However, as a businessman, citizen and public official, I believe it is the best of a whole lot of unattractive options. It is a fiscally sound tax base for education, it grows with the growth and numbers of students, and it is not as volatile as the property tax based. It is not likely to be constitutionally challenged, it is sound for business, it provides certainty and indicates a state which can manage its finances, and it diminishes the prospects of further increases in business taxes, direct or capital gains. It is politically sound -- 80% of the taxpayers in the state benefit, it does not pit town against town, and it doesn't rely disproportionately on the elderly, and it reinforces New Hampshire values, long-term fiscal soundness."

Mr. Walsh stated that personally he is convinced that whether or not Hanover is a donor community, the state absolutely needs another broad based tax to deliver on its education responsibilities. He is also convinced that the tax needs to equitably spread the burden among all of the taxpayers in the state, not depending on where a person lives. He feels that the fact that the tax is based on geography as opposed to the ability to pay is borderline criminal.

Mr. Manchester commented that he could not believe that Senator Below's bill was defeated by such a large margin.

It is Ms. Griffin's understanding that the reason for the defeat of Senator Below's bill is that the Republicans really turned out in force and also that 25 Democrats voted against the bill. The presumption is that they voted against the bill because the Governor had indicated that she would veto it. She also thinks that some legislators are still struggling with the adequacy issue, and that before there is talk about implementing anything they should be much more comfortable with the formula and the adequacy amount that is required. The assumption is that the next election will be a sort of referendum on the whole education issue, and that it is possible there will be Republicans and Democrats alike considering running who may or may not be behind a broad based tax.

Mr. Colligan indicated that he represents a voice of Hanover people who are against an income tax on this rancorous debate. He feels that the Board was very well versed on HB 117 and that a very decisive communication was made to the constituents and legislators.

He thinks that the Board reached out to its legislators as best it could at every step of the way to try to have a dialogue in order to monitor the situation and be responsible to the Hanover taxpayers. He noted that Hanover is a very affluent town with respect to the rest of the state, but added that the lead attorney for Claremont has said that adequate education has been litigated for 28 years just in New Hampshire. There is no definition that is a workable definition, and he feels this is the basis of the entire legislative gridlock.

Mr. Colligan stated that he did not intend to criticize the tremendous work and effort that the legislature has been applying to this very complex issue. He noted that it is an important issue to everyone because education is the basis of democracy, and it is not possible to have a strong democracy without a great education system. He added that New Hampshire has some communities that have had a very difficult time funding education. Mr. Colligan pointed out that out of the first 16 towns that received money from this redistribution, only one of those towns spent it on education. Many of those towns are sending it back as tax cuts, and some are spending it on non-education spending.

Mr. Colligan stated that he personally believes a solution can be arrived at within the existing framework, and that the \$825 million figure is too large a number. He feels it does not make sense that there are 40 towns having to redistribute to 190 towns, and pointed to the evidence that exists that they are not spending it on the schools. He noted that even if they were spending the funds on the schools, there is no framework to measure whether it gets the parents involved in those schools, whether it improves the curriculum in the schools, and whether it really translates into education improvement. He feels that the people funding this redistribution deserve some accountability.

Mr. Colligan feels that this method severs local control, and that educational policy has to be accomplished in the legislature in conjunction with the local school districts. He feels that the best the Board can do is to continue to try to communicate to the Hanover taxpayer. He thinks it is appropriate for the matter to go to the entire state in 2000 in the form of a referendum, but that hopefully in the meantime there are no schools closing because they are running out of money. He feels that communities like Hanover that have always made education a priority are now getting penalized, and communities that have not made education a priority are basically getting funds that have been redistributed that will not in the end improve education. He would wish to continue working as a Selectman in terms of informing the community, recognizing that he is constrained in terms of how he can advise the legislature as a Hanover selectman because a third to one-half of the Town is not in favor of an income tax.

Mr. Walsh noted that he would not like to see the Board make income tax a litmus test in Hanover; he does not think that is a useful thing to do for Hanover voters.

Ms. Connolly stated that she finds it interesting that as part of the new House bill they are establishing a commission on fairness, something that the donor towns have put into their

field research for the donor community lawsuit. She indicated that she cannot in any way promote the particular structure of the statewide property tax as it can only become worse, more onerous and more unfair. Her advice is to continue to tell the legislature that the statewide property tax is not sustainable financially, legislatively or constitutionally.

Mr. Manchester indicated that he agrees the system is not right, and feels that there has to be a revenue source first before the educational system can be corrected. He does not see how enough revenue can be generated without having an income tax. He feels it is not fair to retired people who own a lot of property.

Ms. Connolly pointed out that realistically the projected tax at the moment is not \$6.60, but rather \$7.25 because of the present level of valuation.

Mr. Walsh noted that the scariest number is a set of responsible projections based on normal growth in numbers of students and modest increases in education costs; projected into the year 2005, the statewide property tax rate would be \$10.50 to fund adequacy. This would take Hanover's donation from \$1.4 million which is where it is at \$6.60, to approximately \$5 million just by the operation of the present law.

Ms. Black stated that the problem with the property tax in the long run is that a company looking to move into New Hampshire will not be welcomed by a town if it will push them into a donor situation. She feels that the statewide property tax would be a death knoll on economic development. She added that she has been a proponent of income tax, feeling that it is the one fair tax where people are taxed on the ability to pay not on what they own.

She indicated that she would support an income tax. Ms. Black added that she had received a call from an individual wondering about all of the out of state owners with thousands of acres in current use. She suggested that one way of solving some of the impact of the statewide property tax would be to revisit the issue of current use to possibly give it a bigger base.

Mr. Colligan commented that if \$800 million is focused on as a starting point, then all of the scenarios mentioned are correct. He contends that it is not an \$800 million problem; the evidence coming in is that the communities are not spending the funds on schools. He feels that if the figure is scaled back and it is done on a means testing basis, something should be able to be done within the existing property tax that would not put the state in financial jeopardy. He understands that there are political differences and he respects that; however, he feels that the right thing to do would be to put the matter on the 2000 ballot as a referendum, not necessarily local.

Mr. Walsh feels that the Selectmen could legitimately take a position and communicate it to the legislators that if there is going to be statewide property tax it has to sunset in two years.

Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen communicate to the legislators their position that any statewide property tax include a two year sunset provision. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION.

Mr. Colligan stated that he did not know enough right now due to the complexity of the

situation and what might happen to vote definitively on the motion. He acknowledged that he sees merit to the sunset provision, but also sees merit in not sunseting it, leaving it in the hands of the legislature because that is where the authority is.

The Board of Selectmen VOTED FOUR IN FAVOR, ONE (MR. COLLIGAN) ABSTAINING TO COMMUNICATE TO THE LEGISLATORS THEIR POSITION THAT ANY STATEWIDE PROPERTY TAX INCLUDE A TWO YEAR SUNSET PROVISION.

Mr. Walsh stated that he feels there should be a public hearing, assuming that a statewide property tax of \$6.60 passes, on whether Hanover should join the donor community litigation.

Ms. Black suggested that there not be a public hearing until the report is received from the consultants.

Mr. Walsh stated that he is against litigation and is not ready to say that Hanover should litigate. On the other hand, as he looks at the position the Town is being put in as a donor and how he believes the data will come in, he thinks it is almost irresponsible not to consider litigation and possibly do it. He would love to hear an informed presentation to the public and then listen to the conversation. The Board would then have to make a decision whether or not to join litigation. He added that if the statewide property tax does not include a sunset provision but is in perpetuity, he feels that the Town would have to be involved in the litigation.

Ms. Connolly noted that if the statewide property tax prevails in its present structure, based on the fact that it is inequitable she feels the least that can be done is to try to make it as equitable as possible.

Ms. Griffin reminded the Board that she would need to put the discussion of the tax rate target on the next agenda to obtain direction from the Board as the budget is put together. She suggested that the Board may

want two or three different scenarios depending on what the legislature does.

Ms. Black commented that the Board should be very careful in setting a tax rate target to look at what services it wants to offer and articulate it to all citizens of the Town so that as things are not done the way they are used to having them done, they realize that there is a reason. She noted that the citizens of Hanover expect a certain level of service, and it could be a real selling job telling them why those services would not be able to be provided.

Mr. Donovan pointed out that the Planning Board discussed recently whether the Town ought to consider adopting impact fees. He noted that Hanover is seeing some pretty significant subdivisions proposed. He feels that it would be appropriate for the Town of Hanover to at least consider implementing impact fees.

Ms. Griffin agreed that the alternative to cutting expenses is to look for new sources of revenue to offset the tax rate impact of the statewide property tax. She noted that there

are a number of places the Town can look to generate additional revenue within what the statute allows. Impact fees are just one of a dozen or so tools that have already been discussed as a means to generate revenue.

Mr. Manchester noted that impact fees had not worked in Lebanon, and asked why that was the case. Ms. Griffin explained that the problem in Lebanon is that theoretically impact fees need to be spent in a certain period of time after they are collected, and impact districts need to be established where the impacts are felt by development. The money then has to be spent in that district within a six year period. Lebanon found it impractical to collect that money and spend it on infrastructure improvements within the six year time frame.

Ms. Black asked that the Board keep in mind how overworked some of the Town departments are as it heads into this budget review. She feels that either services will have to be cut or personnel will need to be added. She agreed that outside revenues may be of some help, but they do not really solve the problem. She recalled that when the Town cut back in the 1980's it eliminated a lot of public work projects, which is now coming back to haunt the Town. There is a similar situation existing in the schools where they have cut back on maintenance year after year.

Mr. Walsh indicated that there is a School and Finance Committee Meeting Wednesday, November 3rd at 8:30 a.m. at the superintendent's office. He asked Ms. Griffin to provide the same information regarding education funding to this committee.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Ms. Griffin reminded the Board that they are to meet at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday, November 4th with the Howe Library Facilities Committee and some of the Trustees of the Howe Library. The Corporation meeting will then commence at 3:30 p.m.

Ms. Griffin reported that Van Chesnut of Advance Transit had informed her of some public workshops in to take public input on the Advance Transit schedule. The meetings will be held as follows: Tuesday, November 9 at noon at Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center; Tuesday, November 9 at 4:30 p.m. at the Lebanon Senior Center; Wednesday, November 10 at noon in the Courtroom of Hanover Town Hall; and Wednesday, November 10 at 7:00 p.m. at the Hartford Town Offices. She added that Advance Transit had a consultant reviewing their schedules and routes, particularly the blue route and the free fare zone. They will be looking at revising the schedules to improve the service.

Mr. Walsh inquired as to the status of the ridership numbers that Mr. Chesnut was to provide to the Board. Ms. Griffin explained that he had provided her office with those numbers, and she simply has to get them to Mr. Gilbar so that they can be graphed. Mr. Walsh stated that he would prefer to see Mr. Chesnut provide the Town with the graphs; Ms. Griffin answered that it is much easier for her staff to put the numbers in the format they want them to be. She indicated that the ridership numbers are steady at over 70 in the morning and again in the afternoon, a net increase of between 45 and 50 people. She added that there are days when parking is maxed out at Thompson Arena parking lot and there have been complaints from users who are unable to find parking spaces.

Counting is done on a weekly basis to track who is parking there, and the problem is that between Co-Op employees, high school students and downtown users there are days when there are more than 150 to 160 people using the lot. Ms. Griffin noted that she had met with representatives of the Co-Op recently indicating to them that a situation exists where the Town may have to disinvite them from parking at Thompson. One of the suggestions she wished them to consider would be paying for their prorated share of the use of those spaces; the Co-Op will take a look at what that number would be in their budget. They also discussed parking at Centerra and shuttling in, and also about their providing incentives for their employees to carpool.

Mr. Colligan asked for a sense of what is happening downtown in terms of available parking spaces. Ms. Griffin answered that in general there is more room and available parking in the downtown area.

Ms. Griffin reported that the Vital Communities of the Upper Valley will be conducting a Traffic at the Millennium Workshop on November 2nd at the new Miller Auto showroom on Route 120 from 7 - 9 p.m. All Board members are welcome to join the group, as well as members of the Planning Board.

5. SELECTMEN'S REPORTS

Ms. Connolly

Ms. Connolly reported that on Tuesday, November 9 the Planning Board will be meeting in Etna at Trumbull Hall. The Planning Board meeting on November 2 will include consideration of the lights at Ivy Pointe. In addition, a Dartmouth fraternity wants to add staircases, bathrooms and an another room, and the Planning Board will also hear for the second time in about a year a case where an approved site plan wishes to keep its power above ground. She added that Mr. Bailey was given a two year extension on his subdivision, and there was an informal preliminary hearing from Simpson Development Corporation on the possibility of their developing a good portion of that site.

Ms. Connolly also reported that there will be a meeting of the Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission on November 10.

Ms. Black

Ms. Black reported that leaf recycling was held by the Recycling Committee recently, but was not well attended. The Committee plans to hold another leaf recycling day on November 13th. She also reported that the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee met and is hopeful that work is moving forward on the CDBG application. Thanksgiving dinner is scheduled for November 18th for seniors.

Mr. Manchester

Mr. Manchester reported that the November 2 meeting of the Planning Board will also deal with more lights for Dartmouth College in the vicinity of the tennis courts. This item may be delayed, however, because some abutters will not be able to be present at the meeting.

He also reported on an upcoming Howe Corporation meeting.

Mr. Walsh

Mr. Walsh reported that he had received a letter from Elaine Bent asking to be relieved of her responsibilities as a Conservation Commission member. He thanked Elaine noting that she was a great Conservation Commission member, and she will be missed.

Mr. Colligan

Mr. Colligan also wished to thank Elaine adding that she is a great example of volunteerism who did some very valuable work on the Commission without always receiving appropriate credit. He added that he really enjoyed working with Elaine, noting that she was very valuable to the Commission's efforts. He indicated that he looks forward to continuing to work with her.

Mr. Colligan referred to the recent presidential town meeting held in Hanover, and indicated he was happy to report that Vice President Gore agreed with him that it is not just about spending on education, and mentioned standards and accountability.

Ms. Black noted that she would like to take a moment to thank all Hanover employees who helped make the recent town meetings successful. The employees all put in extra hours to make everything run smoothly. She feels that Hanover was portrayed very positively across the nation, that the people asking the questions were intelligent and well spoken, and that the Town and Dartmouth College deserve a lot of credit for pulling off something that might otherwise have been very difficult.

Ms. Black indicated that she had sent newspaper clippings of the meetings to Nihonmatsu. Mr. Walsh suggested that those articles be sent to Joigny as well.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business to come before the Board.

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - September 13, 1999; September 27, 1999

Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen approve the minutes of September 13, 1999, as corrected. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 13, 1999, AS CORRECTED.

Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen approve the minutes of September 27, 1999, as corrected. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 27, 1999, AS CORRECTED.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to adjourn the meeting of the Board of Selectmen. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to go to nonpublic session to discuss a matter which may affect the reputation of an individual. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO GO TO NONPUBLIC SESSION TO DISCUSS A MATTER WHICH MAY AFFECT THE REPUTATION OF AN INDIVIDUAL.

SUMMARY

- 1. Mr. Walsh MADE THE MOTION that the Board very much support completion of the Biodiversity Grant and that the Town commit, although not necessarily from the General Fund but perhaps from the Conservation Fund or through private donations, the sum of \$2,500 to complete the work. Ms. Black SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO VERY MUCH SUPPORT COMPLETION OF THE BIODIVERSITY GRANT AND THAT THE TOWN COMMIT, ALTHOUGH NOT NECESSARILY FROM THE GENERAL FUND BUT PERHAPS FROM THE CONSERVATION FUND OR THROUGH PRIVATE DONATIONS, THE SUM OF \$2,500 TO COMPLETE THE WORK.**
- 2. Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen communicate to the legislators their position that any statewide property tax include a two year sunset provision. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION. The Board of Selectmen VOTED FOUR IN FAVOR, ONE (MR. COLLIGAN) ABSTAINING TO COMMUNICATE TO THE LEGISLATORS THEIR POSITION THAT ANY STATEWIDE PROPERTY TAX INCLUDE A TWO YEAR SUNSET PROVISION.**
- 3. Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen approve the minutes of September 13, 1999, as corrected. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 13, 1999, AS CORRECTED.**
- 4. Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION that the Board of Selectmen approve the minutes of September 27, 1999, as corrected. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 27, 1999, AS CORRECTED.**
- 5. Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to adjourn the meeting of the Board of Selectmen. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.**
- 6. Ms. Black MADE THE MOTION to go to nonpublic session to discuss a matter which may affect the reputation of an individual. Ms. Connolly SECONDED THE MOTION and the Board of Selectmen VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO GO TO NONPUBLIC SESSION TO DISCUSS A MATTER WHICH MAY AFFECT THE REPUTATION OF AN INDIVIDUAL.**

Board of Selectmen
November 1, 1999
Page -14-

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Colligan, Secretary

These minutes were taken and transcribed by Nancy Richards.